Mary Smith.

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY
EDITED BY ERNEST RHYS

HISTORY

DURUY'S HISTORY OF FRANCE

WITH AN APPENDIX (1871–1914) BY LUCY MENZIES AND AN INTRODUCTION BY R. WILSON

VOLUME ONE

THIS IS NO. 737 OF *EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY*. THE PUBLISHERS WILL BE PLEASED TO SEND FREELY TO ALL APPLICANTS A LIST OF THE PUBLISHED AND PROJECTED VOLUMES, ARRANGED UNDER THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS:

TRAVE L SCIENCE ❦ FICTION
THEOLOGY & PHILOSOPHY
HISTORY ❦ CLASSICAL
FOR YOUNG PEOPLE
ESSAYS ❦ ORATORY
POETRY & DRAMA
BIOGRAPHY
REFERENCE
ROMANCE

IN FOUR STYLES OF BINDING: CLOTH, FLAT BACK, COLOURED TOP; LEATHER, ROUND CORNERS, GILT TOP; LIBRARY BINDING IN CLOTH, & QUARTER PIGSKIN

LONDON: J. M. DENT & SONS, LTD.
NEW YORK: E. P. DUTTON & CO.

"CONSIDER HISTORY WITH THE BEGINNINGS OF IT STRETCHING DIMLY INTO THE REMOTE TIME; EMERGING DARKLY OVT OF THE MYSTERIOVS ETERNITY. THE TRVE EPIC POEM AND VNIVERSAL DIVINE SCRIPTVRE. . . ."

CARLYLE

A SHORT HISTORY OF FRANCE : By VICTOR DURUY VOLVME I

LONDON & TORONTO
PUBLISHED BY J·M·DENT
& SONS LTD & IN NEW YORK
BY E·P·DUTTON & CO

First Issue of this Edition . *November* 1917
Reprinted . . . . *August* 1918

INTRODUCTION

It is customary for a biographer to pay some particular attention to a great man's ancestry according to the flesh. It would be well if more attention were occasionally paid to his intellectual descent. The ancestry of Jean Victor Duruy in this respect is of special interest, for the French historian was in the direct line with men of no less distinction than Michelet and Guizot.

The lives of these three historians cover a period of rather more than a century, and that one of the most eventful and significant in history, whether ancient or modern. Their dates are:

Guizot, 1787–1874
Michelet, 1798–1874
Duruy, 1811–1894

so that their joint period covers not only the French Revolution and the succeeding world-upheaval but brings us down to two decades beyond the Franco-German War and within twenty years of the greatest of all world contests. If the three men had confined their intellectual and literary attention to their own times they would have had more than enough material upon which to exercise their marvellous gifts as historians.

It is not our present business to trace the interesting story of the life of Guizot or the fascinating biography of Michelet, but to show the nature of the connection between these two men and Duruy. The last-named was born only a few months before Guizot was made professor of modern history at the Sorbonne, where, by his first course of lectures, he began the great modern revival of historical research in France. Some eighteen years later Michelet became deputy professor under Guizot in the literary faculty of the university and at the same time began the composition of his *Histoire de France*. Duruy had studied under Michelet at the *École Normale Supérieure* and at the age of twenty-four acted as his deputy at the school and accompanied him on his travels in search of

historical material. Together the three men are largely responsible for the marked advance in historical knowledge which distinguished France among the nations in the nineteenth century, and what is more important, for the inauguration of historical method of the most precise scientific character. It is worth noting in passing that Guizot published in the early part of his career a translation of Gibbon, was at one time a refugee in England, a warm friend of Lord Aberdeen, an advocate no less warm of the *entente cordiale* long before the phrase had become familiar in Britain, and wrote one of the best histories of our own Civil War extant.[1]

Duruy was a Parisian by birth, the son of an artisan at the factory of Gobelins (Michelet, by the way, was the son of a master-printer, while Guizot also sprang from the middle class). He was at first intended for the factory, but he quickly showed such outstanding intellectual ability and distinguished himself so greatly at the *École Normale Supérieure* that this plan was given up and he was left free to prepare himself for teaching, which is work that is highly honoured in France. He passed quickly to the higher branch of educational work, but as quickly paid for his precocity. In a very short time ill-health compelled him to resign his post at the *École Normale*, and when he had sufficiently recovered he looked about for the means of making a living and found it in the writing of school-books. It is possible that the plan was suggested by Michelet, who had himself edited and written books of this class in the early part of his career. Duruy put his best efforts into the work and his secondary text-books soon won for him no small measure of public notice. The comparative seclusion of this period had benefited his health and he now felt able to accept the offer of a chair in the *Collège Henry IV.*, which he held for over a quarter of a century.

Meanwhile, he had been pursuing his historical studies with great ardour, and at the age of thirty-two he published his *Histoire des Romains et des Peuples soumis à leur Domination.* This work was the product of indefatigable research, and yet, to the surprise of large numbers of his fellow-countrymen, was very readable. The two-volume edition of this book, issued 1843–44, was really only a beginning of his *magnum opus.* In spite of numerous other duties he found time during the middle period of his career to pursue his researches still further, and he published, between 1877 and 1885, a seven-volume

[1] *Histoire de la révolution d'Angleterre depuis Charles Ier à Charles II.*

edition with the title *Histoire des Romains depuis les Temps les plus Reculés jusqu'à la Mort de Theodòse*. Upon this work rests his fame as a scientific historian and it was his interest in the Romans which led to his becoming a statesman and accomplishing work of the utmost benefit to his countrymen. Napoleon III. had made a study of the career of Julius Caesar and needed assistance in his task of research. He enlisted the help of the author of the *Histoire des Romains* and was so much impressed with his abilities that in 1863 he made him Minister of Education.

Duruy's work for the schools had already filled him with an ardent desire for educational reform, and in his general attitude towards this great question he followed the lead of Michelet, who, a quarter of a century before, had conducted a spirited campaign against the increased Jesuit activity of the later thirties, lecturing against the clerical party with such fire and eloquence that the government had been forced to stop him because his impassioned advocacy of the secular solution threatened to lead to breaches of the peace. Duruy also earned for himself the bitter opposition of the clerical party, but he held on his way in spite of it. He remodelled the system of higher education, took steps to draw teachers and educationists together in conference so that they might discuss their work and enlighten each other; drew up a course of higher education for girls under secular teachers; and insisted upon the efficient teaching of modern history and languages in both the colleges and the *lycées*. He also meant to make elementary education free and compulsory, but although he greatly improved the system of primary instruction he was not allowed to carry out the wider plan. He relinquished his educational administrative work in 1869 and after the fall of the empire he took no further part in the control of public affairs. He was elected to the assembly in 1884 and died ten years later.

The influence of Duruy's educational experience and enthusiasm is evident in all his literary work. He is concerned not only to discover facts and causes, but also to transmit his information in such a shape that it can be readily assimilated by those who have not trodden the same intellectual path as himself. He is not content to find out the truth and leave it lying about in disjointed fragments, but eager to hand it on. Hence he writes with a fervour only too rare in historical works, and with a predilection for the personal aspect of history which is very human, and which is, wrongly enough, supposed

to be the antithesis of all that is "scientific" in historical research. He even personifies the nation, and his history may be said to take the form of a biography of France, "the soldier of God."

As we read we are continually conscious of a glow of personal feeling, of the gradual unrolling of a great human panorama, "a fayre field full of folke," like that which Piers Plowman saw as he lay dreaming among the Malvern Hills. It is by no means easy to say with any degree of exactness how the historian produces this effect. But in the earlier portion of his book, at least, it is done by the use of copious extracts from the chronicles and other "sources" which were nothing if not human, even to the verge of gossip. Duruy has, moreover, an eye for the telling sentence which slips readily into the mind, is retained without effort, and illuminates, as with a search-light, some barren tract of historical record. Thus, to quote only one example, he lets in a flood of light upon the Dark Ages when he reports the saying of a certain far-seeing abbot about the devoted work of the copyists:—"Every letter written is a wound inflicted on the devil."

He is equally vivid and personal in his description and summary of character, and seems to be consistently obsessed with the fear that the men and women of whom he is writing may remain mere names written upon sand. His portrait of St. Louis may be taken as a good example: "The true hero of the Middle Ages, a prince as pious as he was brave, who loved feudalism, and who dealt it many wise blows; who reverenced the Church, and who could, when necessary, resist its head; who respected all rights, but above all followed the course of justice; who had a frank and gentle spirit, a loving heart filled with Christian charity, and condemned to torture the body of the sinner in order to save his soul; who living on earth yet gazed ever heavenward, and who rendered his kingly office a magistracy of order and equity. He was canonised by Rome and the people still picture him seated beneath the oak of Vincennes dispensing justice to all comers." There is something arresting and provocative about such a description, and it prepares us for a careful consideration of the king's true place in history by first of all enlisting our sympathy for him as a man.

Sometimes a mere phrase or a sentence, original or quoted, serves the same vivid purpose as when he speaks of Gilbert of Montpensier, Viceroy of Naples, as "a brave knight but one

who never rose before mid-day"; or sums up the effect of the strong rule of Louis XII. by quoting the saying of a contemporary writer, "No one was so bold as to take anything without paying, and the cocks crowed loudly in the fields without danger." The position and power of the princely houses in the time of Charles VII. is fixed indelibly in our minds by the saying attributed to one of the princes, "He so loved the kingdom of France that in place of one king he would have six"; while the monarch's own position is no less forcibly summed up in the sentence, "He became the chief revolutionary." Such bright expressions are the lamps of history. Future ages will surely bless the German leaders of 1914 for the phrase "a scrap of paper."

Of course, the adoption of the picturesque method is full of danger. In his eagerness to sustain the personal note, a writer may give an occasional wrong impression which no amount of truthful research will ever be able to wipe out. A chronicler is not necessarily impeccable because he is contemporary, as we know to our cost to-day. The picturesque becomes ridiculous when it descends to such sentences as "The streets ran six inches deep in blood." The bold, animated panorama must not be examined with a microscope. No living man could do original work over so wide a field. It is sufficient if he is able to arouse keen attention; to fix the main lines of historical development; to show clearly the "one increasing purpose"; to correlate and co-ordinate the seemingly aimless efforts and struggles of a restless people so full of ideas that they seem to leave no scope for the exercise of originality on the part of any other nation.

Duruy takes special pains to show how the French nation had its beginnings. Indeed, some of those who are most keenly interested in the life of the present day have said that he overemphasises this part of his story. Such a criticism is surely unjust or, at the best, lacking in thoughtfulness. Duruy had fully grasped one great ruling principle of the modern historian, namely, that it is the function of history to teach us first to know ourselves and then to know our neighbours. We cannot arrange for the future unless we have first studied the circumstances and influences which have formed us in the past. That most curious entity, a modern nation, with all its local varieties and its dominating unity, is the product of long centuries of combination, blending, turmoil, and effort, of sub-conscious movement towards some "far-off divine event," and of inter-

course with other peoples, qualified always by a strange exclusiveness and sense of privacy which we call the national consciousness, though we are ignorant to the fullest degree of what we mean. There is no modern " question " which has not its primary root in these matters. Many mistakes might have been spared a nation which had studied its " Irish question " in an intelligent historical manner. A knowledge of the earlier movements and settlements of the races of middle Europe is the key to the problems which will face us during the next generation in that distracted bloodstained continent.

Moreover, Duruy bases his study of the earlier racial movements and the later settlements upon geography, the only satisfactory foundation for history. He recognises the control of the earth from which we spring, of the seas which still mock our mightiest efforts, as well as of climate, which, in spite of our advance of knowledge, reigns supreme over the human race. He traces the evolution of a distinct and separate people moulded physically and mentally by these external things and gradually developing a national mind which finds expression in folk-lore, poetry, family custom, and central organisation differing from those of the surrounding peoples. That which comes to be called " French " is a composite product of mind and soul, but it is based upon physical things.

Yet there are traits which are common to the several nations, and men of Anglo-Saxon stock whose ancestors fought so stoutly through the ages for the principle of government with the consent of the governed cannot fail to be intensely interested in the particulars given by Duruy concerning the consistent efforts of the people of France to control their own political destiny. In our own insular histories the States-General appears for the first time in the record of the French Revolution, and the assembly is usually introduced as a kind of historic relic which has little more than the shadow of a name. Duruy has a different story to tell, a story which is calculated to correct our false impressions and to show the real significance of the popular power in a nation which was destined to be a standard-bearer in the march of democracy. The French Parliament appears to us to be a very human thing when we read how, on one occasion, a list of grievances three hours' long lulled the king into a profound slumber.

Duruy deals shortly and succinctly with the events of the disaster of 1870-71. He volunteered for war service as soon as the struggle broke out, and was therefore in no favourable

position to get the right perspective of the events which were taking place around him. Knowing this we read his scanty comments and his poignant personal references with a real human interest. The terse sentences are wrung from the lips of a brave and proud man upon whom has fallen a misfortune for which he has no personal responsibility, but for which he is determined not to blame his friends. The Preface to the edition of 1873 is printed at the head of this volume because of its intense human interest at a time when the glories of the Marne and of Verdun are fresh in the minds of men. When we consider all the circumstances we are forced to the conclusion that there is no more arresting sentence in the whole world's history than the following:

> "Who knows but that the broken sword, left in our hands after a sudden misfortune, will not one day be required to defend universal liberty against brutal ambition?"

It is interesting to compare Duruy with Macaulay and Green —to whose "school" he may be said to belong—to drop into the conventional academic jargon which each of the three men abhorred. Duruy is like both Englishmen in his fervour, freshness of mind, breadth of outlook, and impatience of restraint. He is like Green in his desire to write of the French nation, rather than to make his book a mere record of statecraft, and in his method of fusing into one coherent whole historical subjects which had hitherto, according to convention, been treated separately; but he has not Green's power of using literature as a prime factor in the national life, or of making local history the starting-point for that of the nation. Moreover, he shares with Green the credit of having aroused a keener interest in modern history in the world of higher education. He resembles Macaulay in pictorial power and personal appeal, in his effort to show the actual life lived by his ancestors, in his vivid portraiture, and in his steady refusal to sink the man and the patriot in the historian.

But literary comparisons are limited in their usefulness. Duruy has left us the best, if not the only, short history of France available for readers who wish to gain a general conspectus of the nation's record, and to obtain some clear idea of the mind and purpose of the people of France from the time of their establishment as a separate nation to the period of "the broken sword." He gave his countrymen a book which is

animated by a glowing but reasoned patriotism, and its popularity in France is a proof that he had his share in the creation of that indomitable spirit which made possible the victories of the Marne and Verdun.

R. W.

The following is a list of Duruy's works:—

Histoire des Romains et des peuples soumis à leur domination, 2 tom., Paris, 1843-44; Histoire Universelle: Publiée par une Société de professeurs et de savants sous la direction de Victor Duruy, Paris, 1846, etc. (Histoire du Moyen Age, Histoire Grecque, Histoire Romaine, Histoire Sainte d'après la Bible, Histoire des Temps Modernes); A General History of the World . . . thoroughly revised, with an introduction and a summary of contemporaneous history, 1848-1901, by E. A. Grosvenor, London [Norwood, Mass., printed 1905]; Atlashistorique de la France, Paris [1849]; Chronologie de l'Atlas historique [being the text to the foregoing], Paris, 1849; Abrégé de l'histoire de France depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'en 1814, avec une géographie physique et politique de la France actuelle . . . Deuxième édition, Paris, 1851: État du Monde Romain vers le temps de la Fondation de l'Empire, Paris, 1853; Histoire romaine, jusqu'à l'invasion des Barbares . . . Troisième édition, Paris, 1855 (the second edition is contained in the Histoire Universelle): Dix-neuvième édition revue et corrigée, Paris, 1899; History of Rome and of the Roman People, translated by W. J. Clarke, edited by J. P. Mahaffy, illustrated with . . . engravings, etc., 6 vols, London, 1883-86.

Histoire de France de 1453 à 1815: Avec 23 cartes et plans . . . rédigé conformément au programme d'admission à l'École Militaire de Saint-Cyr, Paris, 1856; Histoire populaire de la France, Paris, 1862-63; Petite Histoire de France, Paris, 1863: Histoire de France: Vingt-deuxième édition, publiée avec un nouvel appendice de 1815 à nos jours et illustrée d'un grand nombre de gravures et de cartes, 2 tom., Paris, 1908; A History of France . . . abridged and translated from the seventeenth edition by M. Carey, Boston, Mass. [printed 1905].

Petite Histoire de Moyen Age, Paris, 1859; Les Papes princes Italiens, Paris, 1860; Histoire de la Grèce ancienne [new edition], 2 tom., Paris, 1862; Histoire des Grecs, 2 tom., Paris, 1874; Nouvelle édition . . . augmentée et enrichie de . . . gravures et de . . . plans, 3 tom., Paris, 1886-89; History of Greece . . . with an introduction by J. P. Mahaffy, with . . . engravings, maps, etc., 4 vols., London, 1892; Causeries de voyage. De Paris à Bucharest. Première partie de Paris à Vienne, Paris, 1864 [no more published]; Histoire populaire contemporaine de la France, 1864-66; Petite Histoire de temps modernes. Avec une carte de l'Europe en 1648, Paris, 1864; Introduction générale à l'Histoire de France, Paris, 1865; Notes et souvenirs, 1811-1894, etc., Paris, 1901.

Lavisse, E. Un Ministre, Victor Duruy, Paris, 1895.

PUBLISHERS' NOTE.—The present translation is entirely new and is the joint work of L. Cecil Jane and Lucy Menzies.

CONTENTS

VOLUME I

PAGE

PREFACE TO THE EDITION OF 1873 1
PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION 2
INTRODUCTION—GEOGRAPHICAL DESCRIPTION OF FRANCE . 15

THE FIRST PERIOD—INDEPENDENT GAUL (1600 B.C.–50 B.C.)

CHAP.
I. PRIMITIVE PEOPLES: MANNERS AND CUSTOMS (1600 B.C.–125 B.C.) 29
II. MIGRATIONS OF THE GAULS (1600 B.C.–125 B.C.) . 39
III. CONQUEST OF GAUL BY THE ROMANS (125 B.C.–50 B.C.) . 48

SECOND PERIOD—GAUL UNDER THE ROMANS (50 B.C.–A.D. 476)

IV. GAUL UNDER THE EMPIRE (50 B.C.–A.D. 395) . . 59
V. INVASION OF THE BARBARIANS: THE FRANKS BEFORE CLOVIS (241–481) 67

THIRD PERIOD—MEROVINGIAN FRANCE (481–687)

VI. CLOVIS (481–511) 74
VII. THE SONS OF CLOVIS (511–561) 85
VIII. THE SONS AND GRANDSONS OF CLOTAIRE I. (561–618) . 95
IX. STATE OF GAUL IN THE SIXTH CENTURY 103
X. CLOTAIRE II. AND DAGOBERT, SOLE KINGS OF THE FRANKS: ANARCHY AFTER THEIR TIME (613–687) . 119

FOURTH PERIOD—CAROLINGIAN FRANCE (687–887)

XI. RECONSTRUCTION OF THE EMPIRE AND OF THE CENTRAL POWER BY THE AUSTRASIAN MAYORS OF THE PALACE (687–752) 126
XII. THE WARS OF PIPPIN THE SHORT AND CHARLEMAGNE (752–814) 133
XIII. GOVERNMENT OF CHARLEMAGNE 142
XIV. DISMEMBERMENT OF CHARLEMAGNE'S EMPIRE OWING TO THE RISING OF THE NATIONS (814–843) 152
XV. DISMEMBERMENT OF THE KINGDOM OF FRANCE BY THE USURPATIONS OF THE LEUDES (843–887) 160

FIFTH PERIOD—FEUDAL FRANCE (887-1180)

CHAP.		PAGE
XVI.	The Last Carolingians and the Dukes of France (887-987)	174
XVII.	The First Four Capetians (987-1108)	179
XVIII.	France in the Eleventh Century: Exposition of the Feudal System	189
XIX.	Foreign Enterprises during the Second Half of the Eleventh Century	211
XX.	The First Crusade (1095-1099)	216
XXI.	Louis VI. the Fat (1108-1137) and the Communes	225
XXII.	Louis VII. the Young (1137-1180)	237

SIXTH PERIOD—FIRST VICTORY OF THE MONARCHY OVER THE FEUDAL ARISTOCRACY (1180-1328)

XXIII.	Philip Augustus and Louis VIII. (1180-1226)	243
XXIV.	St Louis (1226-1270)	254
XXV.	The Civilisation of the Thirteenth Century	264
XXVI.	Philip III. the Bold and Philip IV. the Fair (1270-1314)	278
XXVII.	The Three Sons of Philip the Fair (1314-1328)	291

SEVENTH PERIOD—THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR—RENEWED ANARCHY (1328-1453)

XXVIII.	Philip VI. Founder of the Line of Capetian-Valois (1328-1350)	295
XXIX.	John the Good (1350-1364)	306
XXX.	Charles V. the Wise (1364-1380)	322
XXXI.	Charles VI. (1380-1422)	337
XXXII.	Charles VII.: To his re-entry into Paris (1422-1436)	357

EIGHTH PERIOD—FINAL VICTORY OF THE MONARCHY OVER THE FEUDAL ARISTOCRACY (1436-1491)

XXXIII.	Expulsion of the English from France and the Government of Charles VII. (1436-1461)	380
XXXIV.	Louis XI. to the Death of his Brother (1461-1472)	400
XXXV.	The Reign of Louis XI. (1472-1482)	419
XXXVI.	The Reign of Charles VIII. (1483-1491)	438

NINTH PERIOD—THE ITALIAN WARS (1494-1515)

XXXVII.	The First Italian War (1494-1498)	450
XXXVIII.	Louis XII. (1498-1515)	456

TENTH PERIOD—FIRST STRUGGLE OF FRANCE WITH THE HOUSE OF AUSTRIA: GROWING POWER OF THE CROWN: THE RENAISSANCE (1515-1559)

XXXIX.	Francis I. (1515-1547)	473
XL.	Henry II. (1547-1559)	498
XLI.	Government of Francis I. and Henry II.	506
XLII.	The Renaissance under Francis I. and Henry II.	515

PREFACE TO THE EDITION OF 1873

At the time when this book first appeared, France enjoyed in herself great prosperity and in the world a place that might well satisfy the most exacting patriotism.

Now the days of misfortune have come; days the sadness of which nothing can relieve and which men of this generation will carry with them all their days—perhaps even to the grave.

But I have altered nothing in these pages, which tell the story of the most illustrious of modern nations; it is impossible for me to conclude this history with the despairing cry, *Finis Galliae.* In spite of passions, of wrong desires, of criminal mistakes, the spirit of order which preserves while reforming prevailed at the last. In spite of international demagogues who would deliver up the fortunes of their country to a coalition of covetous cosmopolitans, I venture to hope that a new France will spring up, ardent in thought and action, to continue the glorious rôle played by the old France in the history of civilisation. The world has still need of this country, whose influence it has so long accepted, to whose attractions it cannot but submit. The world still needs this clear and sympathetic spirit which has given Europe her ideas of right and wrong, which understands how to preserve in utility as well as in frivolity the traditions of art; whose unhappy political experiments have spared others her sad experiences; out of whose mistakes, indeed, the wisdom of nations has been evolved.

Who knows but that the broken sword, left in our hands after a sudden misfortune, may not one day be required to defend universal liberty against brutal ambitions?

France has at least the right to remember that she succeeded three times in arresting or breaking a menacing power, that of Charles V., of Philip II., and of Ferdinand of Austria.

January 1873.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

A GREAT poet of another land once described France as the Soldier of God.

And it does appear that for more than twelve centuries she acted, fought, vanquished, and suffered for the world. By a singular privilege nothing important has happened in Europe in which she has not had a part; no great political or social experiment has been attempted without her; her history recapitulates and sums up the history of modern civilisation. Such was the rôle of Athens in the history of Greece, such, in later days, was the rôle of Rome. For there is always a point where the common life is richer and more intense, a centre on which civilisation seems to concentrate her scattered rays.

Let me sum up in a few words the general trend of the history of France, the part which she has played in the cause of civilisation.

Originally one found only in Gaul—of which Strabo admired the happy nature to the extent of seeing in it a proof of divine providence—a confused mixture of foreign peoples, strangers to each other, Iberians and Gaels, Cimbri and Teutons, Greeks and Italians, dominated by the old Celtic race. And it required the genius of Caesar and his ten legions to conquer and subdue them.

Rome organised the chaos for the first time. To these fighting peoples, who had troubled the ancient world by their vagabond and warlike nature, she brought order and civilisation: she opened up their country with roads, she gave them public buildings and schools. She gave them also laws and government; she bequeathed to them administrative tradition. Gaul was at that time the most prosperous, the most thoroughly Roman, and, therefore, the foremost province of the empire.

But this empire, for which her poets claimed eternity, crumbled to pieces under the accumulated vices of her government. New peoples inundated her provinces, spreading ruin and death. The invasion of Barbarians poured in from every quarter; it succeeded in Gaul alone; the state founded there in time

absorbed all the others. The kingdoms of the Burgundians and the Suevians, the Vandals and the Heruli, the Goths and the Lombards were short-lived. The strongest of them did not survive three centuries, while the successors of Clovis and Charlemagne bequeathed their crown and their title to a house not yet extinct.

Having spread over the whole country, the invasion stopped, recoiled, and disappeared. What if Africa kept the Vandals, Italy the Goths, Spain the Alans and Suevians? France was the headquarters: there the invaders settled down, ceasing indeed to exist for themselves; allowing themselves to be submerged and led by those they had conquered, and above all by the Church. "When you fight," wrote a bishop of Valence to Clovis, "victory is with us."

The bishop spoke truly. The victory over the Franks was the salvation of the Catholic clergy, at that time threatened by more serious danger than they had ever before encountered; Arianism triumphed supreme. The Franks alone were untainted by this heresy, they gave to the Church security and power, conquering all to lay all at her feet. *Mitis, depone colla, Sicamber.*

But an enemy approached which had been up to that time invincible. Islam, starting from Arabia, had spread in three centuries from the Ganges up to the Pyrenees. It would now surmount that barrier. Its urgent forerunners passed the Garonne, crossed the Loire; Christian Europe was threatened. The Franks stopped this advance, and threw back beyond the mountains the Mussulman invasion, which was from this time broken and impotent against western Europe.

The Papacy, newly freed from the supremacy of the Byzantine emperors, was now threatened by that of the Lombard kings. In a time when all questions became religious questions, when society belonged to and hemmed herself in by the Church, when the people showed a docile obedience to the commands emanating from the chair of St. Peter, it was unfortunate that the leader of Christianity ran the risk, in not having political independence, of becoming an instrument of oppression in the hands of a temporal ruler. Pippin and Charlemagne prepared the way for the temporal independence of the Papacy.

The barbarian world fluctuated, vague, undecided, abandoning itself to the many influences with which it came in contact, possessing no common life and consequently no power, no endurance. Charlemagne took it in his powerful hands, fashioned it, organised it, and tried to introduce into this

refractory mass the breath of life. He constituted German and Christian Europe and in taking Rome as his pattern he showed that the foundations of empire must rest on ancient civilisation purified and transformed by Christianity. He set up again, to the misfortune of Italy, the western empire; he created Germany, which had not existed before his time; and he gave to France that European supremacy which the Merovingians had led him to recognise and which she had indeed already exercised.

Charlemagne died; his work fell to pieces, but was not altogether lost. His great figure hovered still, like the genius of order, over these feudal times, entreating the people to leave chaos behind them, to seek union under a leader both glorious and strong. It is impossible to estimate how much the memory of this great emperor helped kings to reconstitute their power and their states.

Under Charlemagne Christian Europe consisted chiefly of the country of the Franks; the old provinces to the north-east of Gaul, from whence the Franks had come, formed the centre of their empire. But their successors allowed this empire to break up. It was divided into kingdoms, the kingdoms in their turn were broken up into fiefs, and France, her boundaries thrown back from the borders of the Rhine behind the Meuse, was nothing but a confusion of small, independent states. Darkness again descended on the world. When it cleared off, a new society had appeared—feudal society, and here modern civilisation begins. Its foundations were laid for the most part in France.

The feudal revolution had its rise in Germany, but it settled in France. It was the feudalism of France that implanted itself in England with William the Conqueror; in southern Italy with Robert Guiscard; in Portugal with Henry of Burgundy; in the Holy Land with Godfrey de Bouillon. These are the great Frenchmen who rearranged the true charter of feudalism, the *Assises de Jerusalem;* who instituted the tournaments, the military orders, chivalry, and heraldry; who together set up the ideals of courage, of purity, of devotion, and of gallantry which have left such lasting traces on modern customs and morals. It was in France that feudalism and chivalry, the aristocracy of society, found their highest expression. It was in France, too, that absolute monarchy came later to its height and later again, democracy, as if the people of France had been entrusted, for the benefit of other nations, with the duty

of experimenting in every form of political constitution down to its uttermost consequences.

Feudalism, so oppressive in its decadence, had its times of greatness too—as when it arrested the second barbarian invasion, that of the Northmen, the Hungarians, and the Saracens—for all power is established by its usefulness and falls by its abuses. Feudalism had also its heroic age, at the time of the crusades, when millions of men came forward to fight for the conquest of a tomb. The crusades were the greatest glory of the Middle Ages, and they belong nearly all to France, like the Truce of God, which they prepared. The East recognised this, for in the East after that time every European was hailed as a Frenchman, and the historian of the crusades gave to his book the title, *Gesta Dei per Francos*.

The Middle Ages are now at the zenith of their glory, and it is in France that their full grandeur is attained. Italy has famous Popes, but a Saint is on the throne of France, "the elder son of the Church." The clergy are all-powerful, but where do we find more striking examples of the lessons in equality and respect for intellect than those the Church gives to feudal society in preserving the system of election, lost elsewhere; in calling the humblest sons of the people to the pontifical chair, making them the equals of the greatest in the land? And where has monasticism with its happy results flourished to a like extent? A French monk, Bernard of Clairvaux, governed Europe. What order can compare with that Order of Citeaux, of which the head was called the Abbot of Abbots; who ruled over 3000 monasteries and raised up again the military orders of Calatrava and Alcantara in Spain; of Abis and Christ in Portugal. A new art, unknown to Greece and Rome, which was neither Teutonic nor Arabic, but to which perhaps the East gave the first inspiration, came to the light of day in those glorious monuments of Gothic architecture, those mighty structures of chiselled stone, at once imposing in their massive grandeur and delicate in their lightness (the cathedrals of Paris, Rouen, Amiens, Chartres, Reims, Bourges, Strassburg, etc.). Paris, "the city of philosophers," is the centre whence a brilliant light shines forth upon the world. Men flock to her schools from the most remote regions, schools which have drawn forth science from the monasteries and secularised it. Great reputations are not made save at her University, which boasts 20,000 students, and where the most illustrious scholars of Germany, Italy, and England were in turn students and professors. Latin

is their common tongue, scholasticism their science. But the language of Villehardouin and Joinville aspires to universality, thanks to the Crusaders who carried it everywhere and to the troubadours and bards who poured forth on Europe a flood of poetry. An Italian who translated into French a chronicle of his own country in 1275 said of the French language, "It is spread over all the world." And Dante's master (Brunetto Latini) used it in writing his *Trésor*, because "the language of France is the most generally known in all nations."

The intellectual domination of Europe is now apparent to us. Civilisation does not march straight forward; it has times of arrest and recoil which would give rise to despair did we not know that human life is a long journey over a difficult road, on which the traveller rises and descends, while advancing always. Up till the time of St. Louis [1] and the Angelic Doctor,[2] the Middle Ages had ascended to the heights of art and science; after that time they fell rapidly, losing themselves in the shoals of the following century in which there was untold misery and suffering.

The thirteenth century has indeed no achievements to boast of. All that it prized or glorified either fell or was lowered to the depths. The Papacy was made ridiculous at Anagni and held captive at Avignon by that same hand of France which had formerly helped it to raise itself above crowned heads. This schism all but destroyed the Church; the Crusaders and the Knights Templars were sent together to the block; feudalism tottered, secretly undermined. A famous noble, the nephew of a pope, was hanged like a common knave; a common knave, a silversmith, received the honour of knighthood.

What is the power which causes this ruin all around it and which raises itself from the debris it has created? The great revolutionary at this time is the king himself, as the aristocracy had been before, as the people were to be after Louis XVI. The monarchy, which not long before could only boast of the four or five towns of Philip I., had in two centuries broken through the circle of feudal strongholds which surrounded it and now went forward with great strides from power to power towards absolute authority. It had regained one by one the public powers usurped by the nobles. On these insubordinate vassals who dated their charters *Deo regnante*, in the absence of a king, the monarchy imposed the king's peace, the king's justice, the king's money; and so, after an interval of three centuries, it reclaimed the right of making laws for the whole state. The

[1] Louis IX. [2] Thomas Aquinas.

last of these capitularies dates from the time of Charles the Simple, and the first ordinance of general interest is in the reign of Philip Augustus. By the time of the Valois, feudalism had none but administrative and military powers.

This revolution from above had been possible because there was also a revolution from below. Philosophy and Christianity had morally wiped out ancient slavery; the invasions had disorganised it; little by little the slaves became serfs, doing only regular work instead of arbitrary work; living and dying—far from a capricious and violent master—on the soil on which they had been born and on which the agricultural family at last began to establish itself. This new class increased in two ways; the slaves elevated themselves, the colonists and dispossessed freemen descended. By the tenth century the transformation had taken place. Few slaves remained; the rural population as well as the greater part of the urban population consisted solely of serfs.

Then another great movement began. The Bishop Adalébro in a Latin poem addressed to King Robert recognised only two classes, the clergy who prayed and the nobles who fought. Below these, according to him, and very far removed from them, grovelled the serfs and labourers who, though they toiled, were of no account in the state. But these men, even though the bishop took no account of them, frightened him. Another revolution sprang up. "Customs change," it cried; "the social power is tottering." It is the answer in every century of those on whom fortune has smiled to the claims of their less fortunate inferiors. The revolution could not be diverted; it began, and drew the labourers from their servitude up to the level of those who were the masters of the country. But it took over 700 years to accomplish this.

The towns gave the signal. Communal insurrection broke in upon liberty and order. The monarchy favoured the movement outside of its own domains, on the lands of the nobles, and the communal militia seconded the king in his feudal warfare. They followed the *oriflamme* against the castles which Louis VI. wished to destroy and they helped Philip Augustus to win the first national victory of France, that of Bouvines (1214). But the communes aimed at a jealous independence, and in their struggle for the independence of the towns they succeeded no better than the castles in their similar endeavour. The kings opposed them both, for both threatened the formation of national life. But instead of restraining these anarchist liberties by bringing them

back to a liberty compatible with order and unity in the state, the monarchy ruined them altogether and thus prepared the gulf which afterwards widened round itself.

But if the castles and communes lost, the little bourgeois towns and country towns gained. The first of these obtained guarantees for their industry and their commerce, for the safety of their property and the persons of their inhabitants; the second saw the conditions of the rural population improved. In the twelfth century the serfs were advanced to the giving of evidence in courts of justice; in the fourteenth the franchise was extended, for the nobles began to see that they gained by having on their land free labourers rather than serfs "who neglected to work in saying that they worked only for the gain of others"; in the fourteenth century the country districts became organised. Ecclesiastical parishes became civil communities; in the fifteenth at last, the rural population achieved political freedom; they took part in the nomination of deputies to the States-General of 1484. Thus the bourgeoisie, dispossessed of exclusive privileges, and the newly enfranchised serfs met midway between servitude and liberty and gave each other the hand.

All countries have had communes and serfs; France alone made of her humbler population the third order or estate of the Estates of the Realm, an order which was adopted and is still in force all over Europe. A new social order began then and altered the division of our flag.

And so the slaves, who in early times were nothing but instruments for work, *instrumentum vocale*, who were bought and sold along with oxen, horses, and ploughs, *instrumentum mutum*, who in the Middle Ages regained their personality and became men, rose still further in the social scale and became citizens. Enriched by commerce, enlightened by science which they had demanded of the universities, prepared for the management of public affairs by their part in the administration of municipal affairs, they were called by Philip the Fair to take their place in political life. Gradually the leaders found their way into the ministries, into Parliament, into the Council, and ultimately to all judicial and financial offices. From there they domineered over the monarchy, sometimes even over the king, but they also, from fear of feudal power, guided their rulers towards absolute power, which they succeeded in establishing.

At the beginning of the fourteenth century, the disposal of the crown was in the hands of the States-General at their

councils; they made the king; in 1357 and 1484 they wanted almost to do away with the monarchy altogether. But feudalism was still too powerful, the strong hand of an individual ruler was still too necessary, and these attempts miscarried. They had not sprung from the general conscience or reflection of the nation, but from the bold thoughts of a few individuals at the sight of the frightful miseries in which France was plunged.

For the monarchy, forgetting to what it owed its existence, had become again foolhardy, feudal; it had driven the country down to the depths whence it was only rescued after indescribable sufferings. Warned by this cruel lesson the monarchy dismounted from its warhorse, laid aside the battle-axe and lance, which had so ill served Philip V. and King John; it came down to the level of the bourgeoisie and remembered its plebeian counsellors. The nobles had nothing for them but disdain, insults, sometimes even exile or the gibbet, though they did not scorn to appropriate the property of those they so wrongfully ill-treated. But the people were not to be discouraged; they always rose again to shelter the rulers who had need of their intelligence and who had nothing to fear from their weakness: they reappeared carrying with them their political gospel, the Roman law, urging their common rights, which rested on equality, as opposed to feudal rights, which were founded on privilege. They banished a Count of Armagnac, condemned a Duke of Alençon to death, burned a Marshal de Retz, and threw a bastard of the house of Bourbon into the river tied in a sack, on which was written, "Let the justice of the king be carried out."

Whence did the people get this confidence, this forcefulness? They had made the king supreme judge of the peace of the country and they had given him three things which together comprised all the rest: public opinion, money, and an army. The Middle Ages knew neither a standing army nor a tax in perpetuity to maintain it. The king lived in his own domain, and had no soldiers except those his nobles chose to send him at a special time and for a special purpose. The advisers of Charles VII., taking a wide view back over ten centuries, adopted from the Roman Empire the double system of standing armies and taxation. This system was created at Rome at the same time as absolute power, which it strengthened and consolidated. It had in France the same result. Louis XI. completed the downfall of feudal aristocracy: Charles VII. and Francis I. led their people away on long expeditions, and when they had

them safely in military camps accustomed them to military discipline. By the sixteenth century the feudalism of France embraced only the nobility.

By means of religious wars and wars of minorities, feudalism attempted to regain its lost power. But Richelieu caused the heads of its leaders to roll on the scaffold and razed to the ground its last strongholds; feudalism fell, broken in pieces, ruined in the anterooms of Louis XIV., who had indeed decorated it with titles and ribbons, but had also chained it to the triumphal chariot of the monarchy.

While dealing with this internal revolution, France was also active outside her own boundaries. Charles VIII. by his expedition into Italy had begun the great wars which, by mixing up the peoples, their interests, and ideas, established from a political point of view the solidarity of European nations, the idea of balance of power: France had twice attempted this task in the Middle Ages, at the time of the crusades from a religious point of view and at the time of Charlemagne in a first grand sketch of social organisation. Both in the sixteenth and in the seventeenth centuries she defended the liberties of Europe against the house of Austria. Under Louis XIV. Austria threatened but was frightened off by the blinding splendour of the civilisation of France, which was reflected even to the most remote regions.

At this period of unhoped-for greatness, French society took a new form. The successor of Hugh Capet ruled over twenty million men and signed his ordinances with the formula, "This is my pleasure." Like the Roman emperors, he was the personification of the law, *lex animata*. He rose higher even than the Empire, to a position similar to those oriental monarchies in which political and religious despotism, in order to be more certain of the blind obedience of the people, attributed to their ruler the powers of a divine being. The king called himself the Vicar of God on earth; he proclaimed his divine right; he set himself apart from humanity. The neighbouring peoples accepted this new theory which France formulated and practised. The divine right of kings was universally accepted, and Europe, with strange docility, modelled all her royal courts on that of Versailles. Louis XIV. was assuredly not a great man, but he was a great king, the greatest Europe has seen.

Always through the history of the world, when an important movement has appeared and persisted, it has been because it was needed; because it was the result of necessary causes and

so justified its existence. But there is nothing immortal in this world. The people—communities of free and active beings—have always new needs : stagnation would be their death. Born of general needs and constraints, a constitution, in order to satisfy them, must give way to the changes which come to pass in ideas and customs, like a supple and elastic covering which yields and extends round the germ which it protects, following its growth. To impose peace and order on a multitude of contrary wills and contrasting passions, to group together adverse elements, one great power was needed to subordinate all others ; it was necessary that local centres of independent life should be extinguished, that the spirit of France should be centred in one man before she could feel the national life pulsing within her. It was necessary, in short, that Louis XIV. should be able to say, "L'État c'est moi," before Siéyès could reply, "L'État c'est nous."

While the monarchy "by divine right" was in the ascendency, a great and confused movement was going on among the lower classes. The Middle Ages, with all their anarchy and violence, had great and strong views of public right ; no tax could be levied without the assent of those whom it would affect ; no law could be passed if it was not accepted by those who would have to obey it ; no sentence was lawful which was not passed by the equals of the accused. These principles, and many others, met with constant opposition, were stifled and reappeared again. There is always some voice raised against them : it is the Sieur de Pecquigny in 1357 ; the Sieur de la Roche in 1484 ; and many others in the states of Orleans and Pontoise ; they are debated in the two assemblies of Blois, above all in that of 1614, of which the records show nearly all the later demands of 1789. And so the traditions of public guarantees and national rights were not lost. Each generation transmitted them to the following generation, and they came thus, increasing with the march of the centuries, to the time when they became part of the national life, when the interests of the many eclipsed the interests of the individual.

The kings heard this independent voice from the deputies of the country with displeasure, and in order to silence it, they ceased from 1614 to unite the deputies. "It is not good," said Louis XIV., "that one should speak in the name of all." But the voice continued to make itself heard, even at the foot of the throne ; feeble and timid in itself, it was powerful by the echoes it evoked. Parliament, "the court of the king," tried

to emerge from the obscurity of its judicial function, to raise itself to the position of a political power. It called itself the "protector born of the people," and as before Louis XIV. it had kept silence, after him it became emboldened to the extent of troubling all the eighteenth century by its quarrels with the court.

Parliament itself had been impotent. Though this aristocracy of functionaries could speak for the people, it could not make them act. But national education had been established. By the work of their hands and by their intelligence, the third order had grown with each generation in wealth and knowledge. In the Middle Ages there was only one form of wealth, the land, and the nobility held that; but free labour created another form of wealth, capital, and that was in the hands of the bourgeoisie. Following close on the heels of prosperity came the desire for knowledge: the minds of the people became enlightened. France had not had Luther and his religious reform, which had left her behind, but she had Descartes, whose philosophical reform urged her forward. She had remained Catholic without the Inquisition, and a renaissance nearly as brilliant as that of Italy had opened up to her the paths of art, science, and truth. These great gifts produced in intelligent minds an awakening which, in conjunction with her men of genius, led France to the greatest age of her literature and for the second time to the intellectual domination of Europe.

Louis XIV. arriving suddenly in the midst of this galaxy of French genius, brought into it order and discipline. But the respect he showed for those who possessed nothing but the gifts of intelligence told against his political system. Corneille, in the palace of Richelieu, was little more than a servant paid to write verses: Racine, Boileau, and Molière might almost be described as the intimates of the great king. Louis XIV., who enjoyed absolute power, was obliged to encourage industry and literature, two forces which were destined to overthrow what he had built up: for the one gave to the working classes the wealth which led it to demand guarantees, and the other that enlightenment which led it to demand its rights.

In the seventeenth century, literature was included in the domain of art, but opposition from the sphere of religious beliefs did not cease. The opponents were the Protestants and the Jansenists; the great pamphlet of that time was written against the Jesuits. In the eighteenth century, absolute power being compromised by the material interests, which multiplied

every day, of commerce and industry, the opposition passed to the realm of politics, and literature, the expression of the new need, took command and seemed to rule supreme. The most virile forces of the French spirit gave themselves to working for the public good. No one tried to write beautiful verse, but rather to formulate useful maxims. The whims and caprices of society were no longer regarded with amusement, but studied in order to improve society. Literature became a weapon which every one, the unskilled as well as the skilled, sought to wield, and which, striking out on every side, worked great and irremediable havoc. By a strange inconsequence, those who had most to fear from this movement, men of letters engaged in political life, were those who applauded it most loudly. But this society of the eighteenth century, in spite of its frivolity and sensuality, egoistical as it was, had yet among its vices the breath of the spirit. Never were the *salons* more animated, never were manners more exquisite, never was conversation more brilliant. Talent took the place of birth, and the nobility, with a chivalrous temerity which recalls that of Fontenoy, endured the fire of the ardent polemic directed against them by the bourgeoisie with a smile on their lips.

Then a tremendous inquiry began. Some one found out and proclaimed the vices of the social organisation; the veil was lifted from the terrible sores which were enervating the country, which were exhausting her, which would kill her were a remedy not found. Others took no account of the ancient structure in which society had sheltered herself so long: in thought they razed it to the ground, to reconstruct on the levelled soil a new society. This strong voice of France was heard beyond her own frontiers; governments woke up; kings and ministers set to work; canals were dug, roads made, industry, commerce, and agriculture encouraged. Justice and beneficence were on every tongue. But France, who had sounded the alarm, showed the danger, and led the rulers of other lands to attack the evil by material reforms, could obtain nothing for herself. Necker and Turgot were sent away as dangerous utopians; Calonne fell the very day he pronounced sentence of reform on existing abuses: the regime would yield nothing—it lost all. The revolution carried everything before it; it proclaimed ideas which are to-day the foundations of our public and private law, and which the republic and the empire scattered all over Europe with our victories. These ideas spread because they can be described in one single word, justice.

It has often been said of the literary genius of France, that its distinguishing feature is its good sense, its reason. I would add also, from a certain point of view, its impersonality. For Rabelais and Montaigne, Descartes and Molière, Pascal, Voltaire, and Montesquieu write for the world as much as for their own country. The aim they pursue is truth; their personal enemy falsehood; and the immortal types they portray belong much more to humanity in general than to France alone. In this sense our literature, like our art, is of all literatures the most human because it is the least exclusively national.

That also is the distinctive characteristic of the political spirit and of the history of France. Nothing exaggerated can endure. Feudalism stopped and recoiled before it had made of France another Germany; the communes were transformed before they made France another Italy: so that France had neither feudal anarchy, from which the one has so lately freed herself, nor municipal anarchy, which has so long delivered the other over to the hands of foreigners. Absolute monarchy, necessary perhaps for levelling the ground, has not been able to perpetuate itself in its divine right, as it had expected: neither has radicalism been able to perpetuate what it was bold enough to call its revolutionary right.

It is this oscillating but continuous progress that constitutes the charm of French history, because one sees in it the progress of humanity. It is not that France has led the world, but that she has often been found in the advanced guard: she has held the flag by which others have often been guided. They followed at a distance, trying to resist and shake off her compelling influence: they talked loudly of her faults and her caprices; they recalled their own most patriotic memories and exalted their own national glories. But the first language they learnt after that of their own land was that of France; the first glance they gave outside of their own frontiers was directed towards France.

After the Battle of Salamis, the Greek generals met together to adjudge the prize of valour. Each one claimed the first for himself, while all were unanimous in according the second to Themistocles.

INTRODUCTION

GEOGRAPHICAL DESCRIPTION OF FRANCE

Boundaries.—Two seas, the Atlantic and the Mediterranean, two ranges of lofty mountains, the Pyrenees and the Alps, and one of the largest rivers of Europe, the Rhine, formed the boundaries of ancient Gaul, which was more than one-fourth again as large as modern France. Not until the treaty of Verdun, in 843, did France withdraw from the Rhine and Alps behind the Meuse and Rhône, and since she recovered her national identity she has persistently sought to recover also her ancient heritage. The frontier of the Alps has been regained ; that of the Jura has been accepted and the Swiss thereby permitted to hold part of her natural territory. More recently, she has once more advanced to the Rhine.[1] But from Dunkirk to Lauterbourg her frontier is exposed. Through this gate all her invaders have entered, and it was this gap which Louis XIV. attempted to close by erecting three lines of fortresses ; which the Revolution and Bonaparte sought to fortify by disseminating in the adjoining districts her ideas and laws, as an advance guard.

General Aspect.—The wide territory of the ancient Gaul is clearly defined by nature. It constitutes an inclined plane from the summit of the Alps to the Atlantic, the higher part of which, from the Var to the St. Gothard, is comprised within two and a half degrees of latitude. The country widens as it descends towards the ocean, until from the mouth of the Rhine to that of the Adour it extends over nine degrees.

The general formation of the French Pyrenees is similar to that of the Alps. The mountains, which fall sharply into Spain, slope gently towards France, their foot-hills spreading out in a north-westerly direction towards the Atlantic.

Two distinct regions are thus formed. The south and south-east is a land of mountains, of forests and pastures, of lakes and swift rivers ; it is peopled by a race, sober and industrious, little given to manufactures, essentially martial. The west and north is a land of gently undulating hills, of fertile valleys and wooded plains, of navigable rivers, of marshes and of moors, of

[1] This was written in 1866.

manufacturing cities and ports. But the mountainous east is pierced by two broad and deep valleys, the great basins of the Rhine and Rhône, and the last spurs of the mountains extend far towards the west. Hence Auvergne, in the heart of France, has its shepherds and goatherds no less than have the Alps; in the valleys of the Rhône and Rhine, as in those of the Seine, Loire, and Garonne, manufacturing and industrial centres are to be found.

This parallelism is of the greatest moment; to it the national unity of France must be attributed. Had the east been peopled only by mountaineers, the west only by sailors, there would have arisen in the country two nations, possibly rendered alien to each other for all time by their divergence of manners and interests, as for long centuries England and Scotland were divided.

Mountains of France.—The characteristic feature of France is the long chain of the Cevennes and the Vosges. This mountain system, which cuts France in two, forms between its base and those of the Alps, Jura, and Black Forest, that vast hollow into which fall the Rhine and the Rhône; its spurs, which determine the relief of northern and western France, mark out the many extensive valleys opening out upon the three seas. Wholly included within French territory, the Cevennes and the Vosges are the backbone of the country. Yet, while they determine the various water-partings, their elevation is in places slight enough to permit the passage over them of roads and canals.

The Cevennes, properly so-called, are entirely included in the department of Lozère, but their offshoots and their name extend, on the one side, as far as Castelnaudary, where they meet the last hills of the Pyrenees, the Corbières, and on the other side as far as Châlons where they join the heights of the Côte d'Or. Low hills, the plateau of Langres and the Faucilles, to the south of Épinal (491 metres), unite the Cevennes with the Vosges, the highest points of which are the rounded peak of Guebwiller (1431 metres) and Haut d'Honec (1431 metres). The principal peaks in the Cevennes are Mont Mézenc in the Vivarais (1774 metres) and Mont Lozère (1490 metres). The culminating point of the Côte d'Or, Tasselot, near Dijon, only attains a height of 602 metres; the peak of Montaigu, in the plateau of Langres, only 497, and the mountains of the Mâconnais scarcely 160 metres. Taken together, the Cevennes and the Vosges form a chain 960 kilometres in length, which is often narrow, but which in the district of Limoges reaches a breadth of 280 kilometres.

The Cevennes, which have their escarpment on the east, only throw out short spurs on this side, falling abruptly into the great trench formed by the courses of the Rhine, Saône, and Rhône. Westwards, however, they throw out from Lozère the mountains of Velay and Forez, dividing the Loire from the Allier, and the mountains of Margeride (1200 metres) which join the mountains of Auvergne where the Puy de Dôme, the Plomb de Cantal, and the Puy de Sancy rise to a height of 1476, 1858, and 1897 metres respectively. All those ranges which cover the district between the Garonne and the Loire start from the tableland formed by these mountains; its undulating surface resembles a sea frozen in the midst of a tempest. On it are the isolated heights of Haut Quercy, Périgord, and Limousin, and its last spurs sink down into the plain of Poitou in the plateau of Gatine (136 metres). In Auvergne, the craters of three hundred extinct volcanoes have been discovered; the mountain sides are still covered with lava, and the presence of hot-water springs indicates the nearness of subterranean fires. Vesuvius was for thousands of years extinct; science cannot assert dogmatically that the volcanoes of Auvergne will not once more become active.

The harsh and barren slopes of Morvan and the Nivernais are united with the mountains of Burgundy, dividing the Seine from the Loire. Behind Orleans, these hills spread out into a wide plateau, further west they throw out a short range which may be regarded as beginning at Alençon (273 metres). Between the Mayenne and the Vire this range divides, and its two chains form the skeleton of the peninsulas of Cotentin and Brittany, which thrust themselves boldly into the sea. At the extremity of each a great naval port is situated; one, Cherbourg, is protected by its breakwater, a granite mountain hurled into the sea; while the large roadstead of the other, Brest, can be entered from the Atlantic only by one narrow passage.

The Argonne (439 metres) and the Ardennes (601 metres), between which flows the Meuse, start from the plateau of Langres and the Faucilles. The Ardennes even cross the river, or rather they part to give it passage. Between the sources of the Somme, the Scheldt, and the Sambre, they form a knot from which the hills of Picardy and the Pays de Caux begin, and extend as far as Cap de la Hève and Cap Antifer by Le Havre. From this same knot begin also the ranges of Artois and the Boulonnais, which fall into the Channel at Cap Gris-Nez, Cap Blanc-Nez, and

the hills of Belgium, which, though of slight elevation, are often steep. The eastern Ardennes form a waste and marshy plateau (698 metres) and join the volcanic hills of the Eiffel (866 metres), of which the last spurs, clothed with vineyards and crowned with old feudal strongholds, form between Cologne and Coblentz the most picturesque portion of the Rhine valley.

The Vosges also fall into the plain on the banks of the great river between Spires and Mayence, at the hills of Hardt (674 metres) and Mont Tonnerre (678 metres). At the source of the Lauter, they throw off a branch, the Hundsrück (821 metres), by which the Nahe is turned aside and the Moselle forced back to the foot of the Eiffel. Closely confined by the Moselle and the Rhine, which flow parallel to them, the Vosges have few foothills, their breadth, sixty kilometres between Colmar and Luxeuil, narrowing to twenty-eight between Phalsbourg and Saverne. In the district of Alsace, their spurs are still covered with picturesque feudal ruins, and the traveller who passes through this fair province constantly finds himself in contact with two distinct ages of the world's history. In the plain there are busy manufactories; in the mountains, dismantled walls and roofless towers of old castles, affording a desolate picture of the days when war was man's chief industry.

Rivers of France.—All the valleys which have their source in the Cevennes and the Vosges are interior, since they begin in mountains which must be regarded as the geographical centre of France. All those which begin from a point without the circumference, beyond the frontiers of France, are exterior. This distinction is not less important historically than it is geographically. The first type of valley has been the cradle of the French nation and of French genius; through the second type foreign influences have found their way.

The eastern slopes of the Cevennes contain only the sources of such small rivers as the Hérault, the Gard, and the Ardèche. The Saône descends from the Faucilles and the Ill from the Vosges. The great rivers which have their sources in the heart of the country flow westwards and northwards, the Moselle uniting France with the lower Rhine, the Meuse affording a passage to the North Sea, the Scheldt whose wide and deep estuary forms at Antwerp the best port in northern Europe, the Somme which forms a tidal harbour of no maritime importance, and lastly the Seine and the Loire, the two chief rivers of France, the banks of which have witnessed the birth and growth of French nation-

ality, from which that nationality has won its way step by step to the Pyrenees, the Alps, and the Rhine.

The Loire, which is liable to sudden floods and which is filled with shifting sands, is the more terrible of the two rivers. Its source is situated on a lofty mountain of the Vivarais, 1400 metres above sea-level. The river has been vainly embanked with great dykes, dating possibly from Carolingian times, and heightened or extended by each successive generation. In 1846 it once more broke its banks, after a violent storm had raged in the mountains around its upper reaches, and in a few hours the flood had swallowed up forty-five millions of capital. To the Loire, the Allier brings those streams of Auvergne which do not feed the Garonne; the Cher brings the waters of Berry, the Vienne those of Limousin and Poitou which do not flow into the Charente, and the Mayenne brings the streams of Maine, Anjou, and Perche. At Nantes, the river has received all its tributaries, but despite the great volume of its water, it is filled, even below that city, with sandbanks which compel large ships to discharge their cargoes at Paimboeuf. The Loiret is nothing but the result of the infiltration of the Loire; it forms a kind of gulf, eight kilometres from Orleans and twelve kilometres in length. It flows at the rate of 42 cubic metres a minute, and is navigable to its source. Its floods correspond to those of the Loire, following at an interval of one or two days.

The Seine rises in the Côte d'Or and has for its tributaries the rivers of Orleans, western Burgundy, Champagne, Picardy, and Normandy. Above Montereau, it only receives the Aube; below Pontoise, only the Eure. Its chief tributaries enter between these two towns, the Yonne, the Marne, and the Oise, the last-named contributing also the waters of the Aisne. It was between these two towns, below the Marne which flows in from the east and above the Oise which flows in from the north, in the very centre of the river basin, that Paris arose.

The Emperor Julian in the fifth century praised the placid beauties of the Seine. But as the hills and plains have been denuded of trees, as the soil has been levelled by cultivation and the bed of the river raised, inundations have become frequent. It was once said that in summer and winter its level remained constant; to-day its height in flood is sometimes seven, eight, or even nine metres above summer level. Great works undertaken at Quilleboeuf and on the lower Seine have removed its shifting sands, regulated its course, and deepened its bed. "If ports are unable to receive vessels, vessels must be built

to fit the ports," said Richelieu some two hundred years ago. The impossibilities of the time of the great cardinal have become the possibilities of to-day ; large vessels from London and Bordeaux are already able to discharge their cargoes on the quays of the Louvre.

The valleys of the Garonne, the Rhône, and the Rhine are exterior, for these three rivers have their source beyond the frontiers of France. They were also the last to become politically incorporated with the French realm, the first in 1271 and 1453, the second in 1481, the third in 1648. In 1789 they all still retained their privileges and distinct organisation, but the two first had already long united their life with that of France, the energy of which, during the Middle Ages, was mainly directed from the north to the south. Henry IV. and Richelieu turned the attention of their countrymen to the Rhine.

If these recently acquired provinces have contributed in small measure to the formation of French nationality, they have yet completed it, since their acquisition brought the country to its natural limits. And all the activity of France, for centuries confined to the central regions, has been extended towards these outlying districts, which are to-day more animated and brilliant than the old provinces ever were. Poitiers, Bourges, Sens, Provins, Tours, Blois, Chartres are impoverished and dead in comparison with Bordeaux, Marseilles, Mulhouse, and Strassburg.

The valley of the Garonne, from the sources of the Neste to those of the Vézère, extends over 300 kilometres. Its southern wall is formed by the Pyrenees, which send down into it the rivers which fall from among their heights, the Ariége, Salat, Neste, Gers, and Baïse. Its northern wall is formed by the mountains of Auvergne and is twice as long. And on this side the river receives from the Agout, Tarn, Aveyron, Lot, Dordogne, Vézère, Isle, and Dronne a mass of water so considerable that at Bordeaux it attains a width of from seven to eight hundred metres, at Blaye it is a gulf, and at Royan a sea.

The Pyrenean isthmus, between the gulf of Lyons and that of Gascony, measures 320 kilometres from Bayonne to Perpignan, and 400 from the tower of Cordouan to Narbonne. In this last direction, it is traversed through two-thirds of its extent by the Garonne, one of the finest of French rivers. Nature has here afforded an admirable route for navigation. From Toulouse, where the Garonne turns towards the Atlantic, to the Aude which falls into the Mediterranean, the distance is only 80

kilometres. The Corbières lie there, but fortunately only their last low hills; at the Col de Narouze their height is only 189 metres, and as Toulouse is 146 metres above sea-level, it is only necessary to ascend 43 metres from that city to reach the summit and begin the descent to the Mediterranean.

Even without reference to history, it could be boldly asserted that for twenty centuries men, goods, and ideas have passed along this route. Here, according to Strabo, was one of the great commercial routes of the Gauls. The Romans and after them the Visigoths followed this path to the conquest of Toulouse, Bordeaux, and Poitiers, thus avoiding the mountains of Auvergne. The Franks traversed the same route in the opposite direction to reach Narbonne. Riquet has there left a deathless memorial of his name, the canal du Midi, better called the canal des Deux-Mers.

This magnificent valley should have its two great towns, one maritime, the other agricultural and industrial, since this is the characteristic of all French rivers. The Rhône has Lyons and Marseilles; the Loire, Orleans and Nantes; the Seine, Paris and Rouen. Le Havre is of recent growth. This curious parallelism is explained in each case by the same causes. Life, abounding in these rich basins, naturally concentrates itself at two points to answer to the double interest which the river serves, the exploitation of the sea and that of the land. On the Garonne, the two towns are called Bordeaux and Toulouse. The former, which, from its moors, can turn only to the sea, has never in itself possessed a continental influence. The latter, which rivals Paris in its position at the entrance of many valleys and in the centre of a fertile river basin, has had a brilliant history and still claims the title of Queen of the South.

The valley of the Rhône is longer but also narrower. The river rises in the Furca glacier. In the Valais its basin, like the Valais itself, has often no more than a league's breadth, and at St. Maurice, where the river forces its way between precipitous walls formed by two mountains 8000 or 9000 feet in height, its width is reduced to some yards. Lower in its course, the Rhône has hollowed out for itself a vast abyss filled by its waters, the lake of Geneva, the fairest of the European lakes. In this extended space the valley widens, and if the harsh mountains of Savoy are bathed by the waters of the lake, 400 metres deep, on the other shore rich plains spread out, the beautiful hills of the Pays de Vaud. Three leagues from Geneva, however, at fort l'Écluse, the Rhône, as at St. Maurice, pours through a terrible

gorge, its depth here, at the time of the melting of the snows, being from 60 to 70 feet. Near Bellegarde, the river vanishes for a distance of sixty paces, for its lower waters have hollowed out a subterranean passage through the midst of a soft stratum covered by some harder rock.

It is not until it has passed the point of the Jura that its basin extends from the Alps to the Cevennes. But the space is still too restricted for it to assume the tranquil character of the rivers of the plain. The lofty mountains which surround it send to it only torrential streams, and the character of the Rhône itself is always doubtful and terrible. From Lyons to the sea it flows with the swiftness of an arrow ; in fifteen hours it reaches Beaucaire. Dykes have been vainly erected on its banks ; the river breaks them and spreads desolation far and wide. When a south wind blows upon the lofty peaks and in a few hours melts the winter snows, or when heavy rains fall upon the treeless Alps, their barren sides pour down a thousand torrents bearing with them sand and rocks and filling their ancient beds. These seek new courses and fill first the rivers and then the parent stream with their troubled and impetuous waters. The Rhône also bears along its course the ooze it receives and thus strews its course with numerous sandbanks ; finally, in the time of its great floods it hurls into the Mediterranean in 24 hours more than five million cubic metres of solid matter. The vast delta, formed by nature in the first ages of the world, is thus constantly increased, so that the space from Arles to the sea is nothing but a great gulf. A delta of sand and rounded pebbles, the Camargue, 74,000 hectares [1] in extent, has forced the river to divide into many arms, which, like those of the Nile, are constantly changing their situation and number. Two alone remain, of which only one is navigable ; even this is closed by a bar which, in the middle of the year, extends 42 metres towards the south and the top of which is often only some decimetres below the surface of the water. This bar has gaps here and there which change constantly under the influence of heavy winds or of floods, the result being that ships often wait for weeks at the tower of St. Nicholas for a favourable opportunity of passing the bar. One day in four the passage is impossible. Thus the great port of the Rhône valley is not situated on the river itself, but at a distance of 50 kilometres eastwards, at Marseilles, and Arles sank into insignificance before the coming of the railway. Between these two towns is a small inland sea, the lake of

[1] A hectare is a French measure containing a hundred ares.

Berre, which affords an excellent port opening on the Mediterranean through a very deep channel.

The Rhône receives only insignificant streams from the Cevennes. But the Alps send into it the Durance and the Isère. Shut in at its source between high mountains, the Durance, despite the fact that it attains a length of 320 kilometres, is nothing but a capricious and devastating torrent. The rocks and sands which fill its course, the swiftness of its current, its sudden changes, render it unsuitable for navigation. Formerly it fell into the Rhône below Arles, across the plain of Crau, the surface of which, 40,000 hectares in extent, consists of rounded stones which the river has borne down from the Alps. There could be no more desolate view than that of the wide river bed, without definite bounds, strewn with huge rocks and arid sands or cut up into innumerable islands. But under the warm sun of the south, where water is the first need of agriculture and increases productivity tenfold, the rivers are alternately beneficent and terrible. All the old Gallic towns which were not on the sea or on the Rhône were built in the basin of the Durance—Briançon, Embrun, Gap, Sistéron, Digne, Senez, Forcalquier. The cities of Aix, Draguignan, and Grasse were founded by the Romans; Arles and Marseilles are of Greek origin. The Isère flows past Grenoble; it receives the Drac, a furious torrent, and the Arc, which comes down from Mont Cenis. Its floods, less frequent than those of the Durance, have sometimes been even more terrible. The Drôme, which flows past Die, falls directly into the Rhône. The Sorgues has its source in the fountain of Vaucluse, the depth of which is unfathomable.

If it possessed no other tributaries, the Rhône could be an excellent military line of defence behind the Alps; it would not be a river of great commercial or political importance. But by the Saône its valley is opened up towards Burgundy and Champagne; by it the produce and ideas of old France enter the provinces which it traverses. Despite its sluggish course, in a bed ill-defined, the Saône is thus one of the great arteries of the country and serves as a link between the south-east and the north. Lyons, the largest town of France after Paris, is situated on its banks, where it joins the Rhône.

The Rhine and the Rhône have similar courses. Rising on opposite sides of the St. Gothard, they rapidly part from one another, the first flowing in a northerly, the second in a westerly direction. Near Bregenz, the Rhine meets the Suabian Alps, which cause it to fall into the lake of Constance, as the Alps

of Savoy cause the Rhône to fall into the lake of Geneva. Checked by the Jura, one river flows round either extremity of that range, only to meet the Cevennes and the Vosges which compel them to turn finally the one towards the Mediterranean, the other towards the North Sea.

Less torrential, less rapid than the Rhône, the Rhine pursues a more winding course. Between the St. Gothard and Basle, it receives the waters of the Aar, which increase its volume two-fold by bearing to it all the streams of Switzerland. It is already navigable over a great part of its length, being free from falls and rapids from Schaffhausen to Laufen. From Basle to near Mainz, its course is filled with numerous islands, which on many occasions have assisted armies in crossing the river. But lower down, the beauty of the views, the number of towns which are bathed by its waters, the rich cultivation side by side with arid and desolate rocks, the feudal ruins which cover all the peaks of the Hundsrück, the Eiffel, and the Westerwald, and finally the nature of the river, now wild and terrible, now gracious and majestic, make this valley one of the most beautiful in Europe.

Below Cologne, the Rhine rolls gently towards Düsseldorf and Holland, its volume increased by the Ill, which falls into it at Strasburg, by the Necker at Mannheim, the Main at Mainz, the Moselle at Coblentz, and by other tributaries. Yet, despite the considerable volume of its waters, like the Rhône, it enters the sea humbly. Like the Rhône, it divides into several arms—the Wahal and Lech, which unite with the Meuse, and the Yssel and Vecht, which fall into the Zuyder Zee. Impoverished by all these losses, the true Rhine, or at least the arm which bears that name, possesses at Leyden, after a course of 1200 kilometres, only the breadth of a wide ditch, and almost vanishes in the sands before reaching the sea. Fortunately the Wahal and the Lech unite it with the wide estuary of the Meuse, and thus lay it open to the navigation of large vessels.

Communications of France.—The Cevennes and the Vosges are not sufficiently lofty to interrupt communications. In the south they permit the passage of the canal des Deux-Mers; in the centre, that of Charolais and Burgundy; in the north, that of the Marne and the Rhine. The offshoots of these mountains, which cover France, have presented still fewer obstacles. The Seine has been united to the Loire by the canals of Orleans, Briare, and Nivernais; to the Scheldt by those of St. Quentin and the Somme; to the Meuse by those of the Sambre and

Ardennes; to the Saône and Rhône by the canal of Burgundy; and to the Rhine by the canal from Vitry to Strasburg. The basin of the Loire has been united with that of the Rhone by the canal of the Centre; the Rhône with the Rhine by the canal of the East; and with the Garonne by the canals of Beaucaire and the Midi. It would not be a very difficult matter to unite the Meuse and Marne with the Saône, and if the Garonne and Loire still remain isolated in respect of each other, the sea yet forms a canal from Nantes to Bordeaux.

Great Lines of Depression and of the Population of France.—France is oriented in regard to the equator and the meridians. Its frontier from Bayonne to Antibes runs in the direction of the parallels of latitude, and while it throws out Brittany, the position of which is exterior, its northern frontier between Cap Barfleur and Cap Gris-Nez is also parallel to the equator. Its chief seaboards on the west are the littoral of the gulf of Gascony and the Cotentin, which would unite if the waves behind St. Malo rose only one hundred metres; on the east the line of the Alps, the Jura, and the Rhine almost exactly follow two meridians. Thus, if on a map of France a square were drawn, having for its four points Caen, Bordeaux, Marseilles, and Dunkirk, and as diagonals two lines drawn from Marseilles to Le Havre and from Bordeaux to Strasburg, the great lines of depression of French territory would also have been traced, and the lines which are followed by the great trade routes, roads, railways, and canals, existing or projected.

From Bordeaux to Marseilles, and from Marseilles to Dunkirk and Rouen, the water communication is very nearly complete; eastwards it is entirely complete from Le Havre to Strasburg, and could be easily completed from Caen to Bordeaux. To unite in this way Bordeaux and Strasburg, it would only be necessary to remove the obstacles which divide the Dordogne from the Allier, since the Loire already communicates with the Saône and the Saône with the Rhine.

These points require closer consideration, despite their apparent materialism, since in them lies the explanation of some of the facts of history. These gaps in the mountains, these depressions of the soil, afford in actual fact the only natural roads which men have so long pursued. By these routes have passed war, commerce, ideas, in a word all the life of the nations which, to assist their eternal quest, have strewn in their path populous cities. Thus, according to the Breton legends, the fairies of Morbihan gently wandered from the heights of their mountains

and on their level surface were able to escape the vast rocks which the astonished traveller meets along the roads. At the entrances, at the ends, in the centres, of these natural roads, and mainly on the banks of rivers, described by Pascal as " the roads which travel ever solitary," great cities are situated, to serve as resting places for merchants and for armies, to serve also as beacon lights of the civilisation which through them has illumined the surrounding land.

The great lines of physical depression have thus been also the great lines of communication and of population ; it may be added that the stream of French unity and nationality still flows along them. In the days of Rome, it was along them that the influence of the south spread over the north ; along them that in the days of the sons of Clovis and of Pippin d'Heristal, under Philip Augustus and Saint Louis, under Louis XI. and Richelieu, the influence of the north spread to effect the absorption of the south. Had high mountains existed between each of our rivers, France would have been as Spain or Italy ; it may be asserted that the inhabitants of each river basin would for long centuries have formed distinct nationalities.

Population spreads rapidly in rich valleys such as those of France, and the remark of Napoleon that Paris and Le Havre are but one city of which the Seine is the chief street might be applied equally to the Loire, the Garonne, the Saône, and the Rhône. But in river basins which are shut away completely from the outside world, life is isolated and patriotism localised. The least open of the valleys of France, that of the Garonne, is also that of which the population has most energetically resisted centripetal influences. Toulouse still murmurs at the memory of that defeat which made it subordinate to Paris, and it is by no means certain that Bordeaux, and all the Midi, do not complain that they have been sacrificed to the provinces of the north.

The Loire and the Seine, on the other hand, between which communication is easy, have almost always lived under the same laws. Paris and Orleans were the two towns of the patrimony of the French kings, and the first acquisition of the monarchy was Bourges. Three centuries later, Charles VII., expelled from Paris, found a refuge there. The Valois seem even to have hesitated between the two rivers. Their sumptuous chateaux are at Fontainebleau and Amboise, St. Germain and Chambord. Blois and Tours were for some time the capitals of Henry III. and Henry IV. The Saône also has almost always

been in dependence on the Seine. The Burgundians paid tribute to Clovis before the Visigoths of Toulouse, and Burgundy never afterwards had more than Capetian dukes. As early as 1310, Philip IV. laid hold of Lyons; in 1349 Philip VI. bought Grenoble and Montpellier; yet the English held Bordeaux for a century after that.

Unity and Position of the French Territory in the True Centre of Europe.—One of the great causes of the physical, and hence of the moral, unity of France is certainly to be found in this facility of communication between the different river basins. They flow into all the seas, but they are readily united with each other. The country affords an example of unity in diversity. And this is the best condition for the development of a great nation and of a powerful civilisation. It may be added that while France is not in the literal or material sense the centre of Europe, she yet occupies a central position in regard to the European seas, since the Mediterranean, the Bay of Biscay, the Channel, and North Sea wash her shores, and in regard to the chief nations of the continent, since she has as her neighbours Spain, Italy, Switzerland, Germany, and England. From these facts have resulted the lengthy wars and the dangers into which she has so often run; but from the same facts has arisen the influence which she has been so often able to exercise beyond her borders.

These points require careful consideration, for only a serious study of the geographical position of France, of her physical configuration, of her soil, and of her climate, can explain the general characteristics of her history. Certain noteworthy details must be added. France includes in her population representatives of all the European races except the Slavs; she possesses also all the geological terrains of the continent, all its climates, the climate of the French plains being the normal climate of Europe. She possesses all the vegetables, 3660 species, or 1380 more than Germany, 2290 more than England, and may rightly be termed the garden of Europe. Finally, the French language, being that which is most easily acquired by foreigners, has become the common medium for the transmission of ideas.

A SHORT HISTORY OF FRANCE

THE FIRST PERIOD—INDEPENDENT GAUL

(1600 B.C.—50 B.C.)

CHAPTER I

PRIMITIVE PEOPLES—MANNERS AND CUSTOMS (1600–50 B.C.)

Primitive Peoples.—Three or four hundred tribes, divided into three great families, the Celts or Gaels, the Belgae or Kymri, and the Iberians or Gascons, formerly divided between them the territory of Gaul.

Celts or Gaels.—The Celts are supposed to have set out from the plains of central Asia in company with the ancestors of those Pelasgi who settled in Greece and Italy, and of the Slavs who remained in eastern Europe. The date of this migration is unknown, but it was long before that of the Germanic tribes who subsequently settled between the Vistula and the Rhine. The Celts advanced westwards to the very shores of the Atlantic, where they saw high cliffs shining white on the horizon and resolved to reach them. They extended their dominion over that great island which lies opposite Gaul, nor did they stay their course until from the summits of the farthest capes of Scotland and Ireland they saw before them only the immensity of the ocean. They could advance no farther; the long journey which had begun in Bactria was completed. The Celts spread and increased over this vast territory, preserving no traces of their Asiatic origin except certain religious beliefs, including, perhaps, the organisation of their priestly caste, and an idiom which, while more divergent from Sanscrit, the sacred language of the Brahmins, than Greek or Latin, was yet closely allied to it, and which serves to reveal the kinship of the Celts or Gauls with the other nations of the great Indo-European family. This language is found to-day in the heart of Brittany, on some coins which have been unearthed in Wales, and in the north of Scotland and Ireland; those who speak it are the last representatives

of this ancient people. Some ruins also remain to bear witness to the imposing grandeur of its lost monuments.

Iberians or Basques.—The Celts, however, found a people already established in Gaul before their coming. The Iberians, who possibly came from the north of Africa and Spain, occupied all the country south of the Loire ; they were specially numerous to the south of the Garonne under the name of Aquitainians, and to the south of the Durance under the name of Ligurian Saliens. Their language was that which is still spoken by the Gascons or Basques in a part of the Pyrenees, and has no connection with any other European idiom.

Belgae or Kymri.—The Kymri arrived last. According to tradition, they crossed the Rhine at some point on its lower course, about 600 B.C., under the leadership of Hu, the mighty warrior, legislator, and priest ; they spread over northern Gaul, even passing the Loire and occupying some of the western districts as far as the Garonne. Their settlement is said not to have been accomplished without lengthy wars, which disturbed the whole of Gaul and induced the emigration of the tribes which they dispossessed. Legend records that some of these passed the Alps under Bellovesius, others the Rhine under Sigovesius.

Phoenicians.—The bold sailors of Tyre and Carthage, who so early explored all the shores of the Mediterranean, appeared at the mouths of the Rhône. At first they were content to trade with the natives, but later, in obedience to that instinct for colonisation which led them to plant settlements on the shores of Africa, Sicily, and Spain, they penetrated into the interior of the country. The legend of the labours of the Tyrian Hercules conceals the authentic history of the expeditions and settlement of the Phoenician race in Gaul. The god, according to the story, reached the banks of the Rhône, where he was compelled to fight a fierce battle. His arrows were spent and he was about to succumb, when his father came to his help. Jupiter caused a rain of stones to fall from heaven and this supplied the hero with new weapons. These stones are still to be seen ; the great plain of la Crau is entirely strewn with them. After his victory, Hercules founded near the spot the town of Nîmes, and in the heart of Gaul that of Alesia. The valley of the Rhône being thus acquired for commerce and civilisation, the hero returned towards the Alps where the gods beheld him scattering the clouds and shattering the mountain tops. Hercules burst open the Col de Tenda, and formed a road from Italy to Spain over the levelled Alps. In distant ages, men loved to attribute to the invincible

arm of a hero the work of countless generations, or deeds which the forces of nature themselves have accomplished.

The Greeks.—The Phoenicians preceded the Greeks in the control of the Mediterranean, but were supplanted by them in Gaul. The Rhodians established themselves at the mouths of the Rhône, while the Phoenician colonies in the interior fell into the hands of the native population. About 600 B.C., the Phoceans founded Marseilles. The Greeks told a poetical story of the foundation of this city. "A Phocean merchant," says the legend, "landed on the coast of Gaul some distance from the mouth of the Rhône, at a point in the dominion of Nann, the chief of the Segobriges, who received the stranger well and invited him to the betrothal festivities of his daughter. According to custom, the young maiden herself offered a cup to that one of her father's guests whom she chose for her husband. When she entered at the end of the feast, bearing the full cup, she paused before the Phocean. Nann accepted his daughter's choice, and gave to the stranger the gulf at which he had landed. At that point Euxenus laid the foundations of Marseilles."

Character, Manners, and Customs.—Despite the divergence in their origin, there was a marked similarity in the customs of all the Celtic and Belgic tribes, which, to foreign observers, appeared to form a single people. The Greeks and Romans saw only Gauls in Gaul, since everywhere they found the same bravery. "They are an untamed race," they said, "who fight not only with men, but also with nature and with the Gods. When it thunders they shoot their arrows at the heavens; they take up arms against a tempest; they march, sword in hand, against rivers in flood or the storm-tossed ocean." And they were rendered still more redoubtable by the fact that their magnanimity was equal to their courage. "Among this frank and simple race," says Strabo, "each resents the wrongs done to his neighbour, and with such sincerity that they all promptly combine to exact recompense."

Diodorus Siculus paints a portrait of the Gauls. "They are tall, with fair skin and hair. Some cut their beards, others allow them to grow to a moderate length, but the nobles shave their chins and wear moustaches which conceal their mouths. They eat, not seated on chairs, but reclining on the skins of wolves and dogs. Beside them are great fires before which are cauldrons and spits from which hang whole quarters of meat. The chiefs are honoured by being offered the best portions. The Gauls also invite strangers to their feasts, and it is only when the meal

is ended that they ask who they are and why they have come into their land. Often during the feasts their speech gives rise to quarrels, and since they despise death, they challenge one another to single combat."

The same writer adds, "The Gauls are terrifying to behold. Their accents are loud and harsh; they speak little, express their meaning by imagery, and it is their affectation to leave most things to the imagination. They are much given to exaggeration, both in praising themselves and in abusing their enemies. Their speech is threatening, their manner haughty and tragic, but they possess intelligence and are able to learn. Among them are poets, called bards, who sing verses of praise or abuse, accompanying themselves on the rotte, an instrument similar to the lyre."

Dress and Arms.—"The Gauls wear a singular dress. They have striped tunics of various colours, and stockings which they call *braies*. Striped cloaks made of a material of small multicoloured squares, heavy in winter, light in summer, are hung to their shoulders with clasps. As defensive arms, they have shields of the height of a man, each of which bears some special mark. As these shields serve not only for defence but for adornment also, some have embossed brass figures on them, worked with considerable skill. Their brass helmets are adorned with large points, which give them a fantastic appearance. To some of these helmets horns are fixed; to others the figures of birds or beasts in relief. They have barbarous trumpets of a peculiar construction, which give a raucous note appropriate to the tumult of battle. Some wear breastplates of iron mail; others fight naked. In place of long swords, they carry short swords hung on their right side by chains of brass or iron. Some trim their tunics with gold or silver edgings. Their swords are no longer than the javelins of other races, and their *saunies*, heavy pikes which they throw, have points longer than their swords. Of these *saunies*, some are straight, and others so curved that they not only pierce but also tear the flesh, and when the weapon is taken out the wound is increased."

Method of Fighting.—"Both for travelling and for fighting they use very largely two-horsed chariots, each bearing a driver and a warrior. From these they hurl their *saunies*, and then descend to attack the enemy with their swords. Some of them so despise death as to enter the battle without any defensive armour except a girdle round their bodies. They carry with them servants, who are freemen, and whom they employ as

drivers and as guards. Before delivering an attack, it is their custom to sally forth from their ranks and to challenge the bravest of their foes to single combat, while they brandish their arms to terrify their opponents. If any accept the challenge, they sing the prowess of their ancestors, extol their own courage, and insult their foes. They behead their conquered enemies, hanging the heads to their horses' necks and nailing them up in their houses as trophies. If the enemy is renowned, they preserve his head in cedar oil, and they have been known to refuse to sell such a head for its weight in gold."

Customs.—Women were free to choose their own husbands. They received a dower, but the husband had to supply a sum of equal amount from his property. The total was possessed in common and passed to the survivor. A boy might not address his father in public until he was of age to bear arms, and a man had the power of life and death over his wife and children. "When the father of a family of high birth dies," says Caesar, "his relatives assemble, and if there is any suspicion attaching to his death, his wives are examined; if their guilt is proved, they are burned to death amid horrible tortures. Funerals are magnificent. Everything which the dead man is supposed to have loved, even animals, are cast into the grave, and a short while before Caesar's expedition those slaves and dependants whom the deceased man was known to have loved were buried with him." Relatives often placed on the bier letters to their kindred, in the belief that the dead would read them.

Religion.—The Gauls worshipped especially the forces of nature, thunder, stars, rivers, the ocean, lakes, and the wind. *Kirk* was the south wind, so terrible in the Rhône valley; *Tarann*, the god of thunder; *Bel*, the sun god; *Pennin*, the genius of the Alps; *Arduine*, that of the vast forest of the Ardennes. At a later date, the druids doubtless urged them to adore moral and intellectual powers—*Hésus*, the god of war; *Teutatès*, the god of commerce and the inventor of the arts; *Ogmius*, the god of poetry and eloquence, who was represented with chains of gold issuing from his mouth to seize and hold those who heard him. The festival of Teutatès was celebrated in the forest by torchlight on the first night of the new year. The chief priest with a golden sickle then cut down the mistletoe, a parasitic plant which grows on the branches of certain trees and which played a great part in the religious ceremonies and in the medicine of the Gauls. But they only prized mistletoe which grew on the oak, their sacred tree. Before a battle they

often vowed the spoils of the enemy to Hèsus, and after a victory they sacrificed to him what remained of the cattle which they had seized. "The surplus of the booty," says Caesar, "was placed in a public depôt; in most towns heaps of the spoils could be seen stored in the holy places. It amounted to contempt for religion for a Gaul to appropriate secretly that which he had taken in war or to rob one of these depôts; the cruellest punishment and torture were reserved for this type of theft."

The Druids.—The priests of the Gauls, the druids, or men of the oak, had lofty beliefs which seemed to be an echo of the great religions of India. They believed in punishments and rewards in a future life. But they believed also in horrible superstitions, and the blood of human sacrifices stained the great altars which they built in the depth of primaeval forests or among the wild moors. "All the Gauls," says Caesar, "are superstitious; both those who are attacked by serious illness and those who are living in the midst of war and danger sacrifice human victims, or swear that they will do so, having recourse for the performance of their vows to the druids. They think that the life of a man is needed to redeem the life of another man from death, and that by the payment of such a price the immortal gods may be appeased; they have even established public sacrifices of this kind. They have sometimes idols of great size, made of osier, the interior of which they fill with living men; these they set on fire, and cause their victims to perish in the flames. They think that the sacrifice of those who have been convicted of theft, brigandage, or any other crime, is most pleasing to the immortal gods, but when such men cannot be found the innocent suffer instead."

All the druids were subordinate to a chief, whose authority was unlimited. "At his death, the most eminent in dignity succeeded him, or if there were many with equal claims, a successor was elected by the votes of all the druids, and the position was sometimes the subject of armed conflict. At a certain time of year they met together in a consecrated place on the frontier of the land of the Carnutes, which was held to be the centre of all Gaul. All who had disputes to settle came to this place from every part of the country, and they obeyed the judgments and decisions of the druids. It was believed that their creed originated in Britain and that it was thence brought over to Gaul. In Caesar's time, those who wished to acquire a more complete knowledge of it usually resorted to that island to receive instruction. The druids did not go to war nor did they pay any of the

taxes imposed upon the other Gauls. Attracted by such extensive privileges, many Gauls attempted to enter the priesthood, but to do so it was needful to learn by heart a great number of verses, and to pass through a novitiate of nine years. It was forbidden to commit these verses to writing, though, in the majority of their public and private affairs, they made use of Greek letters. In the opinion of Caesar, two reasons might be assigned for this law; the first, a wish to prevent their knowledge from becoming known to the many: the second, fear lest their disciples, relying on writing, should neglect their memories. A belief which they specially laboured to promote was that souls do not perish, and that after death they pass from one body to another, a belief which appeared to them to be eminently calculated to promote courage by removing fear of death. The motion of the stars, the immensity of the universe, the grandeur of the earth, the nature of the material world, the strength and power of the immortal gods, were, amongst other subjects, the topics of their discussions; they handed down their knowledge to the young."

Some of their aphorisms were, "Great care must be taken in the education of children"; "Money spent in this world will be restored in the world to come"; "Those who kill themselves that they may die with their friends will find them in the other world"; "All fathers of families are kings in their own houses."

Bards, Diviners, and Prophetesses.—Connected with the order of druids, were the bards, diviners, and prophetesses. These last, renowned magicians, loved to live in wild caverns, dashed by some stormy sea. The nine druidesses of the Ile de Sein, at the western point of Brittany, were credited with knowledge of the future; it was believed that by their words they could calm or raise tempests. Others who inhabited an islet at the mouth of the Loire were obliged at a certain season of the year to destroy and rebuild the shrine of their god. As soon as the first ray of sunlight appeared the hut was shattered under their repeated blows, and another temple was quickly erected in its place. But woe to one who allowed a single piece of the material of the new building to fall. She was speedily torn in pieces by the hands of her sisters, maddened by the event, and her bloody flesh was scattered before the sacred edifice.

The *ouadds*, or *diviners*, were concerned with the whole material side of religion. They sought to discover a revelation of the future in the entrails of a victim or in the flight of birds.

A Gaul undertook no important act without having recourse to the divination of an *ouadd*. Such was the constant curiosity of primitive peoples. They knew nothing of the past, nothing of the present; their sole desire was to penetrate the darkness of the future.

While the power of the druids was undisputed, the bards were the sacred poets summoned to all religious ceremonies. When the military leaders had freed themselves from the domination of the priests, the bards sang in praise of the powerful and the rich. From singers of gods and heroes they became courtiers of men. They were found at the tables of the great, winning by their verses the right to be seated there. One arrived too late when Luern, king of the Arverni, had already entered his chariot; the bard followed the chariot which was driving away, lamenting in a slow and sad measure the fate of a poet whom time had mocked. Luern was charmed and threw him a purse of gold. Forthwith the *rotte* sounded once more; its chords were struck to a joyous note, and the bard sang, "O king, may gold grow under the wheels of thy chariot; fortune and happiness fall from thy hands."

Druidical Monuments.—In the western districts of France many monuments called druidical may still be found; they are the *peulvans* or *menhirs*, vast blocks of rough stone, either fixed alone in the earth or arranged in rows. In the latter case, they form *alignments*, such as those of Carnac, which are set up in eleven parallel lines in a space of 1500 metres and present a curious spectacle in this barren land. In the past, they were held to be an army of giants suddenly turned to stone as they advanced to some titanic encounter. The *cromlechs* are menhirs arranged in a single circle or in many concentric circles, sometimes around a more lofty menhir; the *dolmens* are great altars formed of one or more great flat stones placed horizontally on many vertical stones. They are known in many departments under such names as *Pierre levée*, *Pierre couverte*, *Pierre levade*, *Table du Diable*, *Tuile des fées*, *Allée couverte*. Some of these stones are seven metres in length and of the same breadth.

These strange monuments occasionally bear great carvings of various kinds. Crescents, round holes arranged in circles, spirals, figures which possibly represent animals or trees interlaced with each other may be found on them. Thus in the Vosges, on the peak of Donon, from which it is possible to see in a single view a great part of Lorraine, Alsace, and the grand duchy of Baden, there is to be found a great slab, and by its side blocks

of scattered sandstone, which bear on them figures of natural grandeur deeply engraved. It is the tomb of Pharamond, according to the local legends ; in all probability it is a druidical monument. The place is well chosen, from it can be seen one of those magnificent views which enable a man without effort to turn his thoughts from earth to God.

The most famous of the druidical monuments are those of Carnac, of Lock-Maria-Ker, and of the moor of Haut-Brien in Brittany ; the covered way or dolmen of Bagneux near Saumur, known under the name of Roche aux Fées, which is twenty metres long, sixteen wide, and three high ; that of Essé, twenty-eight kilometres from Rennes ; the *Pierre branlante* of Perros-Guyrech, in the Côtes du Nord, which is fourteen metres long and seven broad, and so perfectly balanced that one man is able to rock it though its weight is 500,000 kilograms. A great number of similar stones are to be found in Brittany, along the Loire, in Poitou, Auvergne, and as far as the Cevennes. Another kind of monument is the *tumuli*, mounds of earth which cover a tomb. That of Cumiac is more than thirty metres high.

Ideas live no less than granite. Some remains of druidical ceremonies were practised only two centuries ago in the forests of Dauphiné ; traces of others may still be discovered in the heart of the country.

Government.—The druids, ministers of a bloody religion and the sole repositories of all knowledge, reigned for long by means of their intellectual superiority and of the terror which they inspired. Some three centuries before our era, after terrible convulsions, the chiefs of the tribes and the nobles seem to have cast off the yoke of the priesthood. But the military aristocracy, after its victory, came into contact with two enemies. Some of their own number, of greater ability or courage, united several tribes and made themselves kings. In other districts, the lower classes, and especially the inhabitants of the towns, revolted. The druids joined the rebels against the nobles who had dispossessed them, and in most of the cities aristocratic or monarchic government was abolished and replaced by a democratic government more or less mingled with the ancient elements. In one city the nobles and the priests formed a senate and nominated the *vergobret* or annual judge, and when necessary, a leader in war ; in another the people themselves appointed a senate or magistrates ; sometimes even a king continued to reign in dependence on a general assembly and on the priests. An ancient writer remarks that the kings of Gaul, on their golden

thrones, in the midst of all their pomp and magnificence, were only the ministers and servants of their priests.

State of Gaul in 58 B.C.—This revolution had been accomplished when Caesar undertook the conquest of the Gauls. "In that land," he says, "he found no class of men honoured except the druids and the nobles. As for the masses, their condition was little better than that of slaves, since burdened with debt, crushed under taxes and the encroachments of the nobles, the majority of free men delivered themselves into slavery. The druids, the ministers of the rites of religion, performed sacrifices both for the tribes and for individuals; they were the judges of the people, and cognisant of practically all public and private disputes. When a crime was committed, when a murder took place, when a dispute arose about an inheritance, or about boundaries, they decided the matter; they awarded compensation and inflicted punishments. If a private individual or a public man would not submit to their decision, they excluded him from the sacrifices; this punishment was very rare among them. Those who fell under this interdict were classed among the impious and criminals; every one refused intercourse with them, fearing to be infected by the evil which had fallen upon them; all recourse to justice was denied them and they could attain to no honour."

"The second class was that of the nobles. When they undertook any war—and some war occurred every year before the coming of Caesar—they bore all their arms, and the number of their servants and clients by whom they were surrounded was proportionate to the reputation of their birth and their wealth. Some of these clients devoted themselves to their chief, for life and death; among the Aquitainians, these men were called *soldures*. Their status was such that they shared all the good things of life with those to whom they were bound by a bond of friendship. If their chief died a violent death, they also shared his fate, dying by their own hand, nor, within living memory, had there been any recorded instance of those who were united with a chief by such a pact refusing on his death to die also."

"In the cities which were credited with the best management of their public affairs, there was a sacred law that any one who learned either from his neighbours or by public report news of moment to his city should at once inform the magistrate, without communicating it to any one else, experience having taught them that rash and ignorant men often become alarmed

by false rumours, and are thus moved to crimes and to the adoption of violent lines of conduct. The magistrates used their discretion in suppressing information, only revealing to the people as much as they thought it good for them to know. Only in the assembly might public affairs be discussed."

Industry.—The Phoenicians and the Greeks brought to Gaul the art of working mines, and the Aedui (Burgundy) had manufactures of gold and silver. The Bituriges (Berry) manufactured iron. This last people also discovered the art, which has remained traditional among them, and among the Arverni (Auvergne), of fusing tin on to copper. The Aedui invented plating, and by this means ornamented the bits and harness of their horses. King Bituit had a chariot entirely plated with silver. "Gaul made no less progress," says an able historian of the Gauls, "in the art of weaving and figuring cloth; their dyeing was not without reputation. In agriculture, they had wheeled ploughs, sieves made of hair, and used marl as manure. They made various kinds of fermented drinks, among which were barley beer and wheaten beer mixed with hydromel." They do not appear, however, to have cultivated wheat before the time of Augustus. Though they had little wine, to them is attributed the invention of tuns in which to preserve it. Some of their coins still exist. On some is found a horse without a bridle, or a wild boar, symbolical alike of liberty and war.

Commerce.—Commerce could not have been very extensive since Gaul possessed few articles of export. But the Sequanians (Franche Comté) sent their salt provisions down the Saône to Marseilles, whence they spread over Italy and Greece. Gaul also exported thick cloth, and had much commercial intercourse with the island of Britain, the centre of the trade with which was Corbilo at the mouth of the Loire.

CHAPTER II

MIGRATIONS OF THE GAULS (1600 B.C.–123 B.C.)

Invasion of Spain.—The reputation of the Gauls for daring stood higher than that of any of the barbarous peoples of antiquity; every land experienced to its cost the courage of the Gallic race, whose warlike temper led them to invade all countries bordering on their own. They made trial of fortune

beyond the Alps and Pyrenees, in the valley of the Danube, in Greece, and even in Asia.

Having driven the Aquitainians from the banks of the Loire beyond those of the Garonne, they penetrated at some unknown period into Spain, and the Celtiberians, the tribe which afterwards offered the most vigorous resistance to the Romans, were, as their name implies, formed by a mingling of Celts with Iberians. Numantia, "the second terror of Rome," was a city belonging to this people, while in the southern extremity of Lusitania there was found a small tribe known as the *Celtici*.

Invasions of Italy and taking of Rome.—The Gauls are said to have twice crossed the Alps, once under the name of Umbrians, and again as the Insubres, Cenomanni, Boii, and Senones. In the dim ages of antiquity, they twice conquered those northern districts of Italy in which their descendants have so often fought. Their wars with Rome were long and bloody, and alone of all the enemies of the Republic they broke through those walls which Pyrrhus and Hannibal could but view and curse from a distance.

According to the half-mythical story of their invasion it was in the year 390 B.C. that 30,000 Gauls of the tribe of the Senones crossed the Apennines, invaded Etruria, and demanded from the people of Clusium the cession of their lands. The latter in terror closed their gates and implored the aid of Rome. The senate despatched envoys, the three Fabii, to interpose their mediation. "By what right do you attack the Etruscans?" asked Q. Ambustus. "We bear our right as you Romans, at the point of our sword, for all things belong to the brave," answered the Senonian chief. The Fabii were angered by such boldness; forgetting their character as ambassadors, they joined the besieged in a sortie, and one of them, Q. Ambustus, even slew in view of the two armies a Gallic chief whose arms he captured.

The barbarians forthwith abandoned their attack on Clusium and demanded reparation from Rome. The whole body of the *Feciales*, in the name of religion, insisted that justice should be done, but the influence of the Fabian *gens* carried the day. The guilty were acquitted, and the people, as if struck by madness, selected them as three of the six military tribunes.

At this news the Senones, reinforced by some bands from the banks of the Po, marched on Rome, without attacking a single town or plundering a single village on their route. They marched down the left bank of the Tiber, until, having approached to within half a day's journey of the city, they found by the Allia

a Roman army drawn up in a long line on the farther bank, its centre occupying the plain, its right posted on the hills, its left covered by the Tiber. The attack was first delivered on the side of the hills, where the right wing, composed of veteran soldiers, held firm. But the centre, terror-struck by the shouts and by the savage appearance of the barbarians, who advanced striking their shields with their weapons, broke its ranks and threw the left wing into disorder. All who failed to swim the Tiber and take refuge behind the walls of Veii perished in the plain or in the banks and bed of the river. The right wing, which remained intact, retreated towards Rome, and without garrisoning the walls or closing the gates, hastened to occupy the citadel upon the Capitoline Hill (July 16, 390). Fortunately for them, the barbarians waited to plunder, to behead the dead, and to celebrate by orgies their easy victory. Rome had a respite in which to recover from her stupor and to take measures which might yet redeem her reputation. The senate, the magistrates, the priests, and a thousand of the bravest among the patrician youth fortified themselves in the Capitol. They carried thither the gold of the temples and all the provisions in the city, while the bulk of the population covered the neighbouring roads and scattered among the neighbouring cities. Caere afforded an asylum to the vestals and to the sacred things.

On the evening after the battle, the watch fires of the Gauls were seen, but astonished to find the walls unguarded by soldiers and the gates open, the barbarians feared some ambush, and delayed until the following day their entry into the city. The streets were silent, the houses deserted ; only in some the barbarians saw with amazement old men seated in their ivory chairs wearing long robes bordered with purple, holding long batons and preserving a calm and impassive mien. These were the men of consular rank, who had offered themselves as victims for the republic, or who had refused to seek refuge among their former subjects. The barbarians thought them to be statues or supernatural beings, but Parpirius struck with his baton a Gaul who had gently passed his hand over his long beard. The Gaul in anger slew him, and this was the signal for a massacre. Nothing living was spared, and after the city had been sacked, the houses were burned.

The barbarians had only seen soldiers and warlike preparations at the Capitol. They attempted to scale it, but as the road up the height was narrow and steep, the Romans had little difficulty in repulsing them, and it became necessary to convert the siege

into a blockade. For seven months the Gauls remained encamped among the ruins of Rome. One day they saw a young Roman slowly descend from the Capitol, wearing priestly dress and bearing in his hand consecrated things ; he was one of the Fabian *gens*. Heeding neither shouts nor threats, he crossed the camp, slowly ascended the Quirinal, and there accomplished the expiatory sacrifices. Then with equal calmness he returned, as little hindered, by the route which he had followed before. Admiring his courage, or struck by superstitious fear, the Gauls allowed him to pass.

"The gods are appeased," said the Romans; "fortune will change." Change it did, since there was perseverance and courage on the one side, blind confidence on the other. In their thoughtlessness, the barbarians had neither reserves of provisions nor means of shelter ; a wet autumn produced an epidemic which decimated them, and famine drove them to spread in small bands all over the surrounding country. The Latins and Etruscans, who had rejoiced at the misfortunes of Rome, were in their turn alarmed. Camillus, the ablest general of the Republic, was then in exile at Ardua ; that city supplied him with soldiers with whom he surprised and massacred a detachment of the Gauls. This initial success reanimated the defence ; on all sides the peasants armed, and the Romans, who were refugees at Veii, proclaimed Camillus dictator. The sanction of the senate was needed to confirm this election. A young plebeian, Cominius, swam the Tiber at night, evaded the enemy's sentries, and availing himself of the briars and arbutus which clothed the steep slopes of the Capitol, climbed up to the citadel. He made the return journey with equal success and bore back to Veii a senatorial commission which served to remove the scruples of Camillus. But the Gauls had noticed his footprints, and on a dark night they ascended to the foot of the rampart. They had already reached the battlements, when the screaming of the geese, dedicated to Juno, awoke Manlius, a patrician renowned for his strength and courage. He hurled down the foremost assailants from the height of the wall. The garrison soon manned the ramparts, and few of the Gauls succeeded in regaining their camp. Thanks to Manlius, the Capitol was saved, but supplies were exhausted, and as Camillus did not appear, the military tribune Sulpicius agreed with the barbarian chief (recalled to his own land by an attack of the Veneti) that the Gauls should retire on receipt of a ransom of one thousand pounds of gold and of food and means of transport to be supplied by the allies of Rome.

When the gold was weighed, the barbarians produced false weights. Sulpicius complained, but the chief cried *Vae victis!* and forthwith threw into the scale his large sword and his belt. The barbarians retired, but Camillus repudiated the treaty in virtue of his dictatorship. He ordered the allied towns to close their gates and to attack stragglers and isolated bands. In the course of the blockade, in which almost 70,000 Gauls had taken part, numerous detachments had left the siege to range over the country. One party had penetrated into Apulia; when it returned, the main body of the army had retired, all Latium was in arms, and the Roman legions were reorganised. Very few of these escaped. The people of Caere massacred a whole troop which fell into their hands at night owing to an ambush; another band was annihilated by Camillus near a town, the name of which has not come down to us. Roman pride converted these trifling successes into a complete victory, and declared that not a single barbarian escaped the avenging sword of the soldiers of Camillus.

Wars of Rome against the Cisalpine Gauls (283–192).—For a hundred years Rome was unable to avenge this affront. Then, in 283, the consul Dolabella entered the land of the Senones with superior forces. He burned the villages, slew the men, sold the children and women into slavery, and only left the country after having converted it into a desert. Rome boasted that not one of the race whose fathers had fought at the Allia survived; that the ransom of the Capitol was found and taken amid the treasures of the Senones. But despite these proud assertions, it was not until 232 that the senate dared to divide among the poorer citizens the land taken from the Senones. The Boïi, who occupied the adjoining territory, refused to allow the Romans to establish themselves so near them, and in response to their appeal almost all the Cisalpine Gauls took up arms. A formidable army of 50,000 foot and 20,000 horse advanced upon Rome. Terror was at its height in the city; the Sibylline books were consulted and required the sacrifice of two Gauls, who were forthwith buried alive in the middle of the cattle market. A "tumult" was then proclaimed; all, even the priests, took arms; 150,000 men were drawn up before Rome, while 620,000 soldiers supplied by the allies were held in reserve. All Italy rose to repulse the Gauls. They approached within three days' march of Rome, but surrounded by two armies, near Cape Telamon, they left 40,000 men on the field of battle (225).

The senate resolved to put forth great efforts to save Italy

from a repetition of such dangers. Two consuls crossed the Po, but the Insubres met their attack with vigour, and they were glad to accept a truce which allowed them to retire without fighting. They reached the land of the Cenomanni, and when, after some days of rest and plenty, they had revived their troops, they ignored the treaty and, advancing along the foot of the Alps, again entered the territory of the Insubres. An army of 50,000 strong attempted to punish this treachery, but was defeated ; a second host of 30,000 allies, which came from Gaul to the help of the Insubres, could not save them. Their king, Virdumar, was slain by Marcellus in single combat, and on his return to Rome the consul celebrated a triumph of peculiar splendour, receiving the third and last *spolia opima*.

The Cisalpine Gauls appeared to have been subdued when Hannibal descended the Alps with a Carthaginian army. He encountered no obstacle in his march from the Pyrenees to the Rhône, but a Gallic tribe, disturbed by his presence in the midst of their land, attempted to bar his passage of that river. He easily overcame such isolated resistance, and on the other bank of the Rhône met the envoys of the Boii who offered to guide him across the Alps. After the victories of the Ticino and Trebia the Cisalpine Gauls crowded to his camp ; they followed his march upon Rome, and it was with Gallic blood that he gained the victories of Lake Trasimene and Cannae.

This extraordinary struggle lasted for sixteen years, and when at last it ended on the field of Zama, the Cisalpines had long forgotten Rome and their subjection to her. But the senate remembered them ; the work of conquest, which the coming of Hannibal had interrupted, was resumed, and the legions did not halt until they had made the line of the Alps the frontier of the Republic. The Boii, a Gallic tribe, refused to accept the yoke of Rome. They preferred to abandon the land which they had occupied for four centuries and sought a home where they might remain free on the banks of the Danube, in the two lands which preserve their name, Bojohemum (Bohemia) and Bojaria (Bavaria) (192).

Invasions of Greece.—At the period which tradition assigns to the passage of the Alps by Bellovesius and the Insubres, and their conquest of the valley of the Po, other Gallic tribes, under Sigovesus, are said to have entered the valley of the Danube. Here they remained lost to history for three centuries. Alexander met them when he approached the Danube, and they sent an embassy to him. "What do you fear?"

the young conqueror asked them, expecting that they would render homage to his valour. "That the heavens will not fall," was the answer. "The Celts are bold," remarked Alexander, and granted to them the title of allies and friends. Half a century later they reappear in arms and aggressive. Alexander was dead; his empire had fallen into an amazing confusion, and the Gauls sold their services to some of his successors. But, about 280 B.C., three tribes, the Tolistoboii, Trocmes, and Tectosages, arrived from Gaul itself, united with the tribes already on the Danube, and decided to invade Macedonia and Thrace on their own account. A *brenn* or general-in-chief was chosen, and a formidable army entered Macedonia. The phalanx was overthrown; three successive kings of Macedonia perished, and the whole plain fell under the power of the Gauls. "From the summit of the walls of their towns," says Justin, "the inhabitants raised their hands to heaven, invoking the names of Philip and Alexander, the protecting deities of their native land."

The Gauls retired in order to secure their booty, and Macedonia breathed again. During the winter, however, the *brenn* prepared new forces; in the spring of 279 he again invaded the country, destroyed the last Macedonian army, and, if terror has not led the Greeks to exaggerate the numbers of their assailants, proceeded to descend into Thessaly at the head of 150,000 infantry and 20,000 cavalry. Such brave spirits as yet survived in Greece gathered at Thermopylae to check this host, and the last fleet of Athens assembled in the Malic Gulf to assist in the defence of the defile.

Energetically repulsed from the pass of Thermopylae, the Gauls discovered the footpath which had once laid Greece open to Xerxes, and curiously enough it was now no better guarded than it had been at the time of the Persian invasion. They hurried to Delphi in order to pillage its treasures. Legend relates that the god, when consulted, answered that he knew well how to defend himself, that an earthquake opened the ground under the feet of the barbarians, and caused the rocks to fall on their heads, while tempest and lightning consumed those of the Gauls who had not perished under the uprooted mountains. This story, a repetition of another of the time of the Persian invasion, is but a poetic version of a resistance organised by the inhabitants of a country well suited for defence. Repulsed from Delphi, the retreat of the Gauls was rendered disastrous by the mountaineers. Hunger and cold inflicted horrible sufferings on them;

their leader, severely wounded, committed suicide in order to escape the anger of his soldiers or from shame at his defeat (278).

The Gauls in the Valley of the Danube.—The remains of the Gallic army returned to the north. Some halted on the banks of the Danube, where they formed the great people of the Scordisci; others joined their companions who were encamped in Thrace. The Gauls of the Danube continued to sell their services to the highest bidder. They supplied Pyrrhus with his best troops, and that prince, who appreciated their courage, was so proud of having conquered the Gallic allies of his rival Antigonus, that he caused their spoils to be gathered from the battlefield and hung from the walls of the temple of Minerva Itodides, with these words engraven beneath them: "Pyrrhus the Molossian, having destroyed the army of Antigonus, offered to Minerva the bucklers of the brave Gauls." At a later date, the Scordisci came into conflict with the legions of the senate, and annihilated yet another legion of the Roman army. After ravaging the whole of Illyria they advanced towards Italy, shooting their arrows in anger at the waves of the Adriatic which barred their further progress. Soon afterwards they collected once more on the Danube, where they were absorbed in the multitude of the barbarous peoples of that district, which the emperors eventually reduced into a province.

The Gauls in Asia (Galatians).—The Gauls of Thrace had a more brilliant fate. Two princes then disputed the throne of Bithynia in Asia Minor, and one of them, Nicomedes, took the Gauls into his pay. They placed him on the throne, and then, finding the land was fertile, its inhabitants unwarlike, its cities rich, they overran the peninsula, holding princes and people to ransom during forty years. "The kings of the East," says Justin, "dared not undertake any war unless they had these barbarians on their side. Such was the terror that the mere name of Gaul inspired, such was the persistent good fortune of their arms, that without their help reigning princes believed their positions to be insecure, while a deposed ruler ever believed that with their aid he might regain his power." Some of these bands encamped on the site of Troy, where mediaeval chroniclers placed the original home of the Franks. Others sacked the territory of the Greek colonies, and some touching verses are extant recording the fate of three Milesian virgins who slew themselves to escape the outrages of the barbarians. "O Miletus, dear country of our birth, we die that we may not fall

victims to the unbridled licence of the cruel Galatians. Three young maidens are we, three of thy citizens, driven to this fate by the warlike violence of the Celts. We could not await the hour when our blood should be shed by some impious murderer; we could not endure their embraces. And in Death we found our saviour."

Gathering eventually in the heart of the peninsula, under various chiefs or "tetrarchs," they established themselves in the district which from them took the name of Galatia. When the Roman legions had conquered Antiochus, King of Syria, at Magnesia, and driven him back beyond Mount Taurus, they would not leave this threatening people uncurbed in the heart of Asia Minor. The consul Manlius conducted a successful expedition against them; the barbarians were divided and defeated in detail (189). Among the prisoners taken was Chiomara, wife of the "tetrarch" Ortiagon. A Roman centurion ravished her, but she obtained from him the promise of her liberty on condition that she paid a sum of money which a Gallic slave was to fetch. When night came, the centurion led Chiomara to the banks of a river where the exchange was to be effected. He went alone, in order that he might not be obliged to share the ransom, which two relatives of the captive brought to the spot. While the Roman counted the gold, Chiomara in her own tongue ordered the Gauls to kill him; then she took his head, and going to her husband, threw it at his feet, informing him at the same time of the wrong which she had suffered and of the vengeance which she had taken.

Rome, content with having conquered the Gauls, left them their liberty, which they preserved until 25 B.C., when, without any renewal of war, Galatia was reduced into a Roman province. Four hundred years later, St. Jerome found in the districts round Ancyra the language which in his youth he had heard spoken on the banks of the Moselle and Rhine. These persistent seekers of adventure, who were supposed so easily to forget their native land on their wanderings, and to be so ready to adopt foreign manners, yet preserved with pious care their customs and their mother tongue.

It is doubtful whether to-day any trace of these ancient Celtic emigrations can be discovered in the Danube valley and in Asia Minor, lands which have been so often ravaged. But in upper Italy, which has been equally occupied by many different races, the Gallic origin of part of the population is revealed by types of countenance and by dialect. So also to-day, in the midst

of English rule on the banks of the St. Lawrence, and in the heart of some valleys at the Cape of Good Hope, may be heard the language carried from the banks of the Seine and Loire by the colonists of Henry IV. and Colbert, and by those who fled owing to the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. This volatile race, it has been said, has preserved its identity in a foreign land with as much success as the Bretons have preserved their peculiar characteristics in France.

CHAPTER III

CONQUEST OF GAUL BY THE ROMANS (125 B.C.–50 B.C.)

Formation of the Province of Narbonne (125). — Rome did not attempt to attack the Gauls until she had reduced their colonies in northern Italy and Asia Minor. Her dominion already extended to Mount Taurus, she held a province in Africa and had occupied Spain, while she still did not possess an inch of that Gallic territory which lay at her very doors. It was, however, necessary at all costs to secure the land route from Italy to Spain, and the Greeks of Marseilles, whom fear and hatred for Carthage had long since brought into alliance with Rome, supplied her with the needed opportunity. That rich and industrious city had filled all the Mediterranean coast of Gaul with its trading stations; its encroachments provoked an attack by the neighbouring Gallic tribes, and it at once appealed to the senate. A Roman army defeated the Ligurians and transferred their land to the Massiliots (154). New complaints brought the legions again into the territory of the Salyes, who were defeated (125), and on this occasion Rome retained her conquests, forming a new province between the Rhône and the Alps. Sextius founded near some hot springs the town of Aix (Aquae Sextii) as its capital. The Aedui, who held the land between the Saône and the Loire (Burgundy), presently sought alliance with Rome; the Allobroges (Savoy and Dauphiné), on the other hand, being nearer neighbours of the new province, attacked it, and 20,000 barbarians were left on the field of battle (121). Next year, the Romans in their turn crossed the Isère, and Bituit, King of the Averni, fell upon their rearguard with a force of 200,000 Gauls. When the barbarian chief, seated on his silver chariot and surrounded by his bodyguard, saw the small numbers of the legionaries, he declared that they would be no

more than a feast for his dogs, but Roman discipline and tactics, and the terror inspired by the elephants, secured the defeat of the barbarian host. Some time afterwards, Bituit was enticed to a conference, seized, loaded with chains, and taken to Rome. The whole district watered by the Rhône, as far as the lake of Geneva, was formed into a province, which in subsequent years was extended to the Pyrenees. The Volcae and Tectosages, who held Toulouse, accepted the position of federati, and the colony of Narbo Martius (Narbonne) was established to watch over these new subjects. Its position near the mouth of the Aube soon made it the rival of Marseilles (118).

This transalpine province, protected by the two colonies of Aix and Narbonne, and by the Tectosages and Aedui, newly allied with Rome, formed an advanced post, from which the senate was able to hold in check and to control the tribes of Gaul.

The Cimbri and Teutones (110): Battle of Aix (102).—The invasion of the Cimbri and Teutones threatened to destroy this recent dominion; three hundred thousand of these barbarians, prevented from passing beyond the shores of the Baltic, spread like a flood over Gaul, and having reached the banks of the Rhône, there overthrew in succession five Roman armies. But instead of crossing the Alps, they crossed the Pyrenees and expended their time and energy in a struggle with the warlike Celtiberians. This was the salvation of Rome. It gained time in which to send Marius to defend the Gallic province. The general encamped on the left bank of the Rhône, and in order to ensure the arrival of supplies which could not reach him when the fords of the river were impracticable, he constructed from the sea to the river a canal which allowed the ships of Marseilles and Italy to avoid the dangerous mouths of the Rhône. They were jestingly nicknamed "Marius' mullets." But in this laborious employment, the legionaries recovered their energy and their discipline and regained that confidence which habits of luxury had sapped, so that when the barbarians reappeared, Marius had no hesitation in measuring his strength with theirs.

It was near Aix that Marius met the barbarian horde. He had fixed his camp on a waterless hill. When his soldiers complained of thirst, he pointed to a stream which washed the camp of the barbarians, crying, "There you may buy water with your blood." But the camp followers, having water neither for themselves nor for their beasts, crowded to the stream; the barbarians, imagining that they were about to be attacked, rushed to arms,

and striking their shields rhythmically, advanced to the sound of this wild music. In passing the stream, however, they broke their ranks, nor had they time to regain their order before the Romans fell upon them from their position of vantage, and charged them with such vigour that after enormous slaughter they were compelled to take to flight. When they reached their waggons, they met a new and unexpected enemy; their women assaulted alike pursuers and pursued, hurling themselves into the midst of the combatants, and with bare hands attempting to seize the swords and shields of their enemies.

After this initial success, the Romans regained their positions as night fell, but their camp did not resound, as might have been expected after so great a success, with songs of joy and victory. The legionaries passed all the night in anxiety and fear, since they were protected neither by trenches nor earthworks. There still remained a great number of barbarians who had not been engaged, and who throughout the night gave vent to horrible yells, mingled with shouts of defiance and lamentations, like the howling of wild beasts. The shouts of this vast multitude caused the mountains to re-echo and struck terror into the Romans; Marius himself, filled with amazement, anticipated a night attack and trembled for the result of a disorderly combat. But the barbarians did not stir from their position either on that night or on the following day; they were occupied in preparing for battle.

This second battle, which occurred two days after the first, was not more fortunate for the barbarians. The main body of the Roman army delivered a frontal attack, while a lieutenant of Marius fell upon the rear of the barbarians, who were unable to resist. A horrible massacre occurred, as was usual in these battles of antiquity when men fought at close quarters, hand to hand. Plutarch records that the corpses rotted away in the plain by the rains which fell that winter, and so enriched the soil that in the next summer it displayed an amazing fertility; that the Massiliots were able to fence their vineyards with the bones with which the plain was strewed (102).

The Suevi and Helvetii: Caesar in Gaul (58).—Rome might no doubt have taken advantage of the victories of Marius to extend her control over Gaul, where, during the very period of the invasion of the Cimbri, she had annexed the rich city of Toulouse. But civil disturbances soon desolated Italy and for forty years paralysed the strength of the Republic. The opportunity which Rome neglected, a German people attempted to

seize. The Suevi followed the route which the Cimbri had pursued, and 120,000 warriors, the advance guard of that great people, penetrated under the command of Ariovistus into the valley of the Saône. The Aedui and Sequani (Burgundy and Franche Comté) implored the protection of Rome against them. At the same time, the Helvetii (Switzerland), incessantly harassed by the Germans, attempted to leave their land, cross Gaul, and establish themselves on the shore of the ocean. Rome had then as consul Julius Caesar, one of the most brilliant geniuses the world has ever known. He desired to overthrow the existing government of his country, and to establish his own power on its ruins, but he lacked wealth with which to bribe the people and military glory with which to win over the soldiers. He therefore caused himself to be nominated governor of the province of Narbonne, with a commission to check the Helvetii and to expel the Suevi.

First Campaign (58): Reduction of the Saône Valley.—Caesar turned first to the Helvetii, whom he checked by a great battle on the banks of the Saône and forced to return to their own country. Having finished this first undertaking, he found himself opposed to Ariovistus. He suggested an interview. "If I have need of Caesar," answered Ariovistus, "I will go to him; if he has need of me, let him come to me." The proconsul resorted to threats: "No one," said the barbarian, "has yet attacked me without repenting. When Caesar so desires, we will measure our strength against each other, and he will learn what manner of warriors are those who for fourteen years have not slept beneath a roof." The soldiers of Caesar were terrified by the accounts which the natives gave of the height and indomitable courage of the Germans, but they advanced against them and in a bloody battle put them to flight. Ariovistus, wounded, recrossed the river with some of his men, and at this news, which spread joy throughout Gaul, the remainder of the Suevi retired to their forests. Two formidable wars had been concluded in a single compaign.

Second and Third Campaigns: Conquest of Belgian Gaul (57) and of Armorica and Aquitaine (56).—The Belgians, disturbed by the near approach of the legions, took up arms, and in the spring Caesar met on the banks of the Aisne 300,000 of these barbarians, who were reputed to be the bravest of the Gauls. A feint attack led the Bellovaci (Beauvais) to hasten to the defence of their homes; other tribes followed this fatal example, and Caesar had only to charge with his cavalry to convert a

retreat into a disorderly rout. For a whole day the Romans slaughtered their enemies without hindrance (57).

The coalition being dissolved, it was necessary to subdue the various tribes in detail. The Suessiones, Bellovaci, and Ambiani (Soissons, Beauvais, Amiens) did not resist, but the Nervii (Hainault) awaited the legions behind the Sambre and were annihilated. The whole Nervian host was slain; "Of our six hundred senators," the old man told Caesar, "three survive; of sixty thousand warriors, five hundred have escaped." This battle, in which Caesar fought not only for victory but for life, placed Belgic Gaul at his feet; only the Aduatici (between Namur and Liège) still remained in arms; their chief city was taken by storm, 53,000 of the tribe being sold into slavery. During this expedition, the younger Crassus, detached with one legion, overran the land between the Seine and the Loire, without meeting any resistance, and at the end of the second campaign Gaul appeared to be subdued.

Caesar was in Illyria when he learned that one of his legions had been cut up in the Valais and that all Armorica (Brittany) had risen. He returned hastily and himself fell upon the Veneti (Morbihan) who, relying on their two hundred vessels, accepted a naval battle in which their fleet was annihilated. This disaster, in which the flower of their nation fell, secured peace. At the same time, Salinus, in the north, dispersed the army of the Aulerci (le Mans), Eburones (Evreux), Unelli (St. Lo), and Lexovii (Lisieux). In the south, Crassus penetrated as far as the Garonne without meeting any opposition, crossed that river, and having defeated an army of 50,000 men, received the submission of almost all Aquitaine. This year the whole of Gaul, from the Pyrenees to the North Sea, had seen the victorious legions (56).

Fourth and Fifth Campaigns: Expeditions beyond the Rhine and to Britain (55–54): Isolated Revolts in Gaul (54–53).—But during the winter, 450,000 of the Usipii and Teutoni crossed the Rhine. Despite the snows, Caesar hastily repassed the Alps; the Germans, deceived by a truce, were surprised, and their host, caught in the tongue of land formed by the junction of the Rhine and Meuse, was almost annihilated. This invasion, and the help which in the previous year the Armoricans had received from the island of Britain, convinced Caesar that if his conquests were to be secure, Gaul must be isolated from Britain and Germany. He accordingly crossed the Rhine, struck terror into the neighbouring tribes, and, returning, struck a blow at Britain.

His disembarkation was difficult, but his army landed after a battle in the waves. It was, however, the season of the full moon; the tide, aided by a violent storm, dispersed a squadron which was bringing Caesar his cavalry and injured his transports. He hastened to attack the islanders, in order that he might speedily return with honour to the continent. "The enemy vanished," said an old chronicler, "as the snow on the seashore disappears before the south wind." This retreat was too much in the nature of a flight for Caesar not to repeat his expedition. In the following year he again appeared in Britain, and on this occasion he compelled the Britons to deliver hostages to him, and to promise an annual tribute.

Ambiorix.—In his first campaign Caesar had driven the Helvetii back to their mountains and the Suevi across the Rhine; he had subdued the east of Gaul. In his second campaign, the north had been conquered; in his third, the west; while in his fourth he had shown the Gauls by his two expeditions into Britain and Germany that they had nothing to hope from their neighbours. In his fifth, he endeavoured to emphasise this lesson by bearing his victorious eagles a second time into Britain. The Gallic war was then regarded as finished; it had not really begun. Hitherto four peoples had fought against the Romans independently: they were now to rise simultaneously.

Caesar, to hold them in subjection, called to his help that profound experience upon which Roman generals based their power. More especially he had favoured the exaltation of some ambitious chieftains, who handed over to him independent cities, in which a Roman party was formed to dominate the public assembly and the senate, to impede their action and betray their counsels. A further means of influence, which he had seized with ability, was to hold estates of the Gauls, in which deputies of all the tribes annually assembled. The most profound peace appeared to reign. This deceptive calm, and the apparent submissiveness of the Gallic chiefs in the estates which he held at Samarobriva, among the Ambiani, filled him with a sense of complete security, and since a drought had produced a scarcity of provisions, he scattered his eight legions over a space of more than a hundred leagues.

There was, however, a vast plot in existence, the soul of which was Ambiorix, a chief of the Eburones, and Indutiomar the Treveran. It was proposed to take up arms as soon as Caesar had left for Italy, to call in the help of the Germans, and to harass the legions in their quarters by cutting completely their

lines of communication. The secret was well kept, but a premature movement amongst the Carnutes kept Caesar in Gaul. Ambiorix, who believed that he had already crossed the Alps, revealed his hand by massacring a whole legion and by attacking a camp of Q. Cicero. At the same time, Indutiomar, among the Treveri, roused the people and threatened the camp of Labienus. North and east of the Loire the revolt became general; only the Aedui and Remi proved traitors to the national cause.

Despite his watchfulness Caesar was surprised. Twelve days had passed since the destruction of one of his legions. One of his lieutenants, Q. Cicero, had been besieged for a week, and not a single messenger had been able to reach his headquarters at Samarobriva (Amiens). At last a Gallic slave made his way through and informed the proconsul of the straits to which his lieutenant was reduced. Caesar had at hand only 7000 men; the besiegers numbered 60,000. But he assumed the offensive and relieved the camp of Cicero, in which only one soldier out of every ten was unwounded. Labienus was equally successful against the Treveri (Treves), and killed Indutiomar. But Ambiorix, though hunted like a wild beast, and chased from hiding place to hiding place, escaped. His people, the Eburones (Limburg), paid for him by suffering extermination.

Sixth Campaign: General Revolt under Vercingetorix (52).—These severities increased the hatred of the Romans, and during the winter, which Caesar spent in Italy, a new revolt was organised. That the union might be indissoluble, military standards were taken to a lonely spot, and on them the deputies of all the allied tribes swore to take up arms as soon as the signal was given. The revolt began with the Carnutes (Chartres). All the Roman inhabitants of Genabum (Orleans), a great trading city on the Loire, were murdered; on the same day news was carried by couriers distributed along the roads to Gergovia (near Clermont), one hundred and fifty miles away. There lived a young Arvernian noble, Vercingetorix, whose father had once attempted to usurp the throne. As soon as he heard of the massacre of Genabum, he raised his people, was invested with the command, and displaying that energy which circumstances demanded, summoned a meeting of a supreme council of the cities of Gaul. From the Garonne to the Seine, all the tribes answered his appeal; the conduct of the war was conferred upon him, with the result that the Arverni, and central Gaul which had hitherto remained apart from the struggle, now took the first place.

Vercingetorix pushed on his preparations with vigour, and gave the confederacy a degree of organisation which had been wanting in all the previous attempts of the Gauls. His plan of attack was ably conceived. One of his lieutenants, Lucter, went southwards to invade the province of Narbonne, while he himself went northward against the legions. But he paused on the way to raise the Bituriges, subjects of the Aedui, and this delay gave Caesar time to arrive from Italy. In a few days he organised the defence of the province, expelled the enemy, crossed the Cevennes through six feet of snow, and carried desolation through the territory of the Arverni. Then recrossing the mountains, he reached the Rhône and Saône by forced marches, crossed, without being discovered, the whole district of the Aedui, and appeared in the midst of his legions. The daring and extraordinary activity of the proconsul served to disorganise the plans of the Gallic chief.

The first efforts of Caesar were directed against Genabum, where a violent night attack on the legions was repulsed and the attacking force either slain or taken prisoners. Caesar passed the Loire by the bridge of Genabum and captured the first town of the Bituriges to which he came, Noviodunum (Nouan or Neuvi-sur-Baranjon). Vercingetorix, hastening to save it, saw its fall, and realised that against such an opponent another type of warfare must be adopted. In a single day, the Bituriges burned twenty of their own towns, and this heroic resolution was imitated by the other tribes. The aim was to starve the enemy, but the plan was not fully adopted. Avaricum (Bourges), the capital of the country, was spared, and Caesar at once hastened to it. In twenty-five days, towers from which an attack might be delivered were built, as well as a great terrace three hundred feet long and eighty high. Caesar records that, in an attempt to destroy his siege works, a Gaul, stationed before the gates, hurled on to a burning tower a ball of tallow and pitch in order to encourage the flames. Struck by an arrow hurled from a "scorpion" he fell; another took his place, a third followed when the second was also mortally wounded, and then a fourth, so that during the whole battle this fatal post was never for an instant vacant. But the town was taken, and of the 40,000 soldiers or inhabitants who guarded it, scarcely 800 escaped.

The provisions which Caesar found in Avaricum supplied him for the rest of the winter. When spring arrived, he despatched Labienus with four legions against the Senones (Sens) and the Parisii (Paris), while he himself led the remainder of his

army against the Arverni. But Vercingetorix covered Gergovia; an attack upon it failed, forty-six centurions fell, and Caesar decided to rejoin Labienus. His march partook of the nature of a flight; the Aedui, believing that he could not retrieve his position, massacred his recruits and the Italian merchants in all their cities. This defection placed the army in a position of such peril that many advised the proconsul to retire into Narbonensis. But if he had been vanquished in Gaul, he would have been proscribed at Rome; he accordingly abandoned any such idea and boldly fell upon the north, leaving 100,000 Gauls between himself and Narbonne.

The chief of the Auleroi, Camulogenus, was at the head of the northern confederates, an able and active veteran, who had his headquarters at Lutetia (Paris). That town was then built entirely on an island in the Seine, was defended towards the south by the marsh of Bièvre. When Labienus attempted to attack it from this side, he was not even able to approach the place. He retired towards *Melodunum* (Melun), seized all the vessels which he found on the river, captured the town, and advanced by the other bank against Lutetia. Camulogenus, fearing that the place would be stormed, burned the town and the bridges, and retired to the heights on the left bank. He knew that the Bellovaci had taken up arms in the rear of Labienus, and he wished to force that general to accept battle, with a great river behind him and enveloped by two armies. But Labienus escaped his vigilance and passed the Seine at a point at which Camulogenus could only oppose him with a third of his forces. The old chief attempted to drive the Romans back into the river; a bloody battle followed, and the Gallic leader perished with almost all his warriors. By this success Labienus only secured his retreat; he hastened to reach the territory of the Senones, in which Caesar had already arrived.

A new assembly of all the deputies of Gaul confirmed Vercingetorix in the supreme command. Three tribes alone were unrepresented, the Ligones (Langres), the Remi (Reims), and the Treveri (Treves). With their help, Caesar, who lacked cavalry, took into his pay several bands of Germans, whom he mounted on the horses of his military tribunes and knights. He met Vercingetorix not far from the Saône. The Gallic cavalry had sworn that they would not see their wives and children again until they had at least twice crossed the Roman lines. Caesar exposed himself to great personal dangers, and even left his sword in the hands of the enemy, but his legions resisted this

furious onslaught bravely, and pursuing the enemy in their turn, drove them in disorder to the very walls of Alesia.

Siege of Alesia (52).—Alesia (Alise on the Côte D'or or, more probably, Alaise, twelve kilometres north of Salins) was built on the summit of a rugged hill, and was held to be one of the strongholds of Gaul. Before its walls, on the sides of the hill, Vercingetorix had established a camp for his army, which still numbered 80,000 infantry and 10,000 cavalry. Caesar formed the bold design of ending the war in a single blow by besieging the town and the army simultaneously. Vast siege works were begun. A first ditch, twenty-nine feet broad and 11,000 long, was dug: behind this was a second ditch fifteen feet deep, and finally a third into which a stream was diverted. The last was protected by an entrenchment twelve feet in height, surmounted with battlements, palisaded for its whole circumference with forked trees, and flanked by towers eighty paces from each other. Before the ditch were placed five rows of *chevaux de frise* and eight lines of stakes fixed in the earth, their points concealed under branches, while nearer the enemy's camp he placed pit-falls filled with sharp thorns. All these works were duplicated on the side of the plain, where the lines of circumvallation reached a circuit of sixteen miles. Five weeks' labour by less than 60,000 men sufficed for this task.

Before the lines were completed, Vercingetorix sent away his cavalry which had become useless and which he could not keep supplied, promising to hold out for thirty days, but urging the tribes of Gaul to rise *en masse*. His appeal was heard; 248,000 picked warriors gathered from all parts of Gaul to relieve their compatriots, and broke themselves against the impregnable rampart of the legions. After having repulsed several vain assaults, Caesar assumed the offensive, defeated the Gauls, cut their rearguard in pieces, and spread through their ranks a terror which served to disperse them. This time Gaul was conquered, and for ever.

The garrison of Alesia was forced to surrender at discretion. Vercingetorix gave himself up in the hope that he might thus secure more lenient treatment for his followers from the pro-consul. Mounted on his charger and wearing his richest armour, he came out of the city alone, galloped to the tribunal of Caesar, and jumping from his horse, cast his helmet and sword at the feet of the Roman, who remained unmoved and stern. The lictors seized him, and Caesar caused him to wait six years for his conqueror's triumph and his own death.

Seventh Campaign: Last Revolts (51): Measures Adopted for the Pacification of Gaul (50).—But Caesar did not dare to winter beyond the Alps ; he was obliged to watch the Gauls of the north and west, who had taken but a small part in the last struggle, and who were secretly arming. In the midst of winter he fell on the Bituriges (Bourges), and carrying fire and sword through their land, compelled the population to fly into the neighbouring districts. The Carnutes (Chartres), who rose again, were severely chastised. The Bellovaci (Beauvais) rose *en masse ;* the proconsul defeated their best infantry at a river crossing and obliged them to implore his mercy ; they and all the towns of the north-east handed over hostages. Caesar entered Belgica, and once more drove Ambiorix across the Rhine ; he then returned, demanded hostages from the Armorican towns, and stifled the revolt between the Loire and Garonne. In a short time the war was confined to the Cadurci (Cahors) at Uxellodunum (Cap de Nac) ; this town was cut off from water and compelled to surrender. Caesar, who would have been ruined by a prolonged war of this kind, resolved to make a terrible example ; he caused the hands of all those who were found in Uxellodunum to be cut off.

This barbarous punishment was the last act of the terrible conflict which decided that the Gauls should not be left free to develop their own national existence. Their civilisation was of a higher order than ordinary accounts suggest, and while it is impossible to say what that civilisation left to itself would have become, it is always permissible to honour a heroic resistance, and to lament the premature overthrow of a great people.

For Rome, the Gallic war was the glorious conclusion of the conquests of the Republic. Caesar had spent eight years on this task ; he had employed ten legions, and the inexhaustible resources of Roman discipline, of his own military genius, and of his unsurpassed activity. Having subdued Gaul by his arms, he spent a whole year (50) in winning her affection and in leading her to forget her defeat. No confiscations took place, no heavy burdens were imposed ; there was a complete absence of those violent and irritating measures which had marked the conduct of so many proconsuls. Gaul was made a province ; but her cities retained their laws and government, and the only sign of the conquest was a tribute of forty million sesterces (7,794,000 francs).

SECOND PERIOD—GAUL UNDER THE ROMANS

(50 B.C.–A.D. 476)

CHAPTER IV

GAUL UNDER THE EMPIRE (50 B.C.–A.D. 395)

Organisation of Gaul by Augustus: Four Provinces, Sixty Cities.—The conquest of Gaul gave Caesar an army experienced in war and devoted to its general, a great reputation, and vast riches. By his victories he won the hearts of those whom he could not bribe; all others he overcame by force of arms, but the civil war and his premature death prevented him from giving his attention to Gaul. Augustus himself was unable to visit the province until he had made himself sole master of the Roman world. Then (27 B.C.) he went to Gaul, and in order to destroy the old tribal organisation, and to obliterate the memory of the past, he altered the boundaries of the provinces and renamed several cities. Aquitaine, which had previously been confined between the Pyrenees and the Garonne, was extended to the Loire. Celtic Gaul, under the name of Lugdunensis, was reduced to the district contained between the Loire, Seine, and Marne. The remainder of the province formed Belgica.

Numerous Roman colonies were established in Gaul in order to strengthen Latin influences. In Narbonensis, Fréjus became one of the great arsenals of the empire, and Arles so grew in size as to be called "the Rome of Gaul." Gergovia, which had witnessed the flight of Caesar, was deprived of its position as capital of the Arverni, which was transferred to a neighbouring village, *Augusto-Nemetum* (Clermont). The city of Bratuspantium was similarly reduced in rank for the benefit of *Caesaromagus* (Beauvais). The name of *Augusta* was added to the capitals of the Suessiones (Soissons), Veromandui (Saint Quentin), Tricasses (Troyes), Rauraci (Augst), Auskes (Auch), and Treveri (Treves). The town of the Turones became *Caesarodunum* (Tours); that of the Lemovici, *Augustoritum* (Limoges), and

Bibracte became famous throughout the whole empire under the name of *Augustodunum* (Autun).

Privileges were also unequally distributed. The Aedui (Burgundy) and Remi (Champagne) preserved the title of allies, which was also granted to the Carnutes, so that in the south, west, and north there were three powerful tribes interested in the maintenance of the new social order. The Santones (Saintes), Arverni (Auvergne), the Bituriges (Berry), liberated dependants of the Aedui, and Suessiones (Soissons) preserved their own laws. Gaul was divided into sixty municipalities, and the number of Gallic tribes recognised as forming the nation was reduced to this number. This dual measure greatly assisted the maintenance of order and the administration of the country, since each of the sixty cities was held responsible for disorders occurring in its territory. To supply them with a model upon which they might organise themselves, Augustus gave them an entirely Roman capital in Lugdunum (Lyons), at the junction of the Rhône and Saône, which became the centre of imperial administration in Gaul. Agrippa built from it his four military roads, leading to the Atlantic, the Rhine, the Channel, and alone the Rhône and Mediterranean to the Pyrenees.

Druidism was still powerful in Gaul. Augustus attacked it skilfully, identifying all the gods of Gaul with those of the Roman pantheon, and building altars to them under double names, Bellen-Apollo, Mars-Camul, Diana-Arduinna. He also forbade human sacrifices and only conferred the rank of a city upon such as would abandon the druidical ruins. These efforts were successful, and no province was so rapidly romanised.

Reorganisation of the Fourth Century: Seventeen Provinces, 120 Cities.—The original organisation of Gaul by Augustus was modified in the fourth century. A prefecture of the Gauls, with its seat at Treves, created and included the three dioceses of Spain, Britain, and Gaul, the last of which was subdivided into seventeen provinces, subdivided in their turn into one hundred and twenty cities. The prefect, the vicar of the diocese, and the seventeen proconsuls or governors of provinces held only civil authority; military power was committed to the counts and dukes, who resided generally on the frontiers.

Each city controlled the villages of its territory, which was often so large as to be exactly represented in many cases by the provinces of the old French monarchy. Touraine, Périgord, Poitou, Quercy, and Berry were only the former territories of Tours, Périgueux, Poitiers, Cahors, and Bourges. In each city

there was an hereditary senate, a *curia* or assembly of proprietors (possessed of at least twenty-five *arpents*[1]), and municipal officers, generally elected by the *curia*, who superintended the affairs of the town and its territory, under the supervision of the governor of the province, who was at first directly responsible to the emperor, and at a later date to the president or vicar of the diocese. This governor did not intervene in the internal affairs of the city, his relations with it being confined to judicial and financial matters. He revised on appeal sentences given by the municipal senates; he received the taxes, and decided the quota due from each; the division and collection of the imposts was made by the *curias* on their own responsibility. Sometimes the deputies of all the towns and even of all the provinces met together, but unfortunately these assemblies, which might have acquainted the central government with the real interests of the provinces, had no regular sessions and fell into desuetude. In 365, Valentinian introduced an important innovation into the municipal system. He established the *defensor civitatis*, a species of tribune of the people, charged with the defence of their interests against imperial officials, the treasury, and oppression of every kind; he was to be chosen from without the order of the *curiales*, the municipal aristocracy. This office was soon almost everywhere confided to the bishops and was the source of their influence over the cities.

Roman Civilisation in Gaul: Schools, Arts, Industry, and Commerce.—The Gauls, condemned to a life of tranquillity, employed in the arts of peace that energy which they had displayed in the arts of war. The druidical forests fell under their axes, or were pierced by roads along which commerce and civilisation flowed. Cities increased, Greek art was introduced, and the Venus found in the ruins of Arles, the Jupiter found in those of Aix, rival the finest statues of antiquity. Triumphal arches, temples, arenas, theatres, and aqueducts arose, nor were they always the work of foreigners. Orange still preserves the fairest triumphal arch which the Romans have left us; Vienne has the temple of Augustus and Livia. Nimes possesses its arenas, which are not the largest extant Roman amphitheatres, but which are the best preserved; its *Maison Carrée*, a beautiful monument which Colbert wished to remove to Versailles and Napoleon to Paris, where it has been more or less copied, since

[1] An old French measure of land which varied from 54,900 sq. feet (royal arpent) to 45,425 sq. feet (common arpent), thus consisting of about one acre and a quarter.

the church of the Madeleine has been built according to its proportions on a larger scale, and finally at some distance the *Pont du Gard*. This vast structure which cuts across the wild valley of Gardon at a height of forty-eight metres is merely part of a vast aqueduct which that rich and pleasure-loving city built to bring to it across ten leagues of mountains and valleys the pure and cool waters of the Cevennes. At the same time, the schools of Bordeaux, Autun, Lyons, and Vienne rivalled those of Greece, and conquered Gaul gave to the masters of the world grammarians, orators, and poets. From her came Valarius Cato, surnamed the Latin siren; Cornelius Gallus, of Fréjus, an elegiac poet, the friend of Virgil and Augustus; Trogus Pompeius, of the land of the Vocontu, the first Latin author of a universal history, an abridgment of which has been preserved for us by Justin; Domitius Afer, the master of Quintilian, by whom he was declared to be the most eloquent orator that he had heard, but whose genius was degraded by his servility. Petronius also sullied the Latin muses by his *Satyricon*, an immoral picture of a profoundly degraded society. Marcus Aper has the honour of being the author of a work which has been attributed to Tacitus. Favorinus of Arles, the celebrated sophist, the friend of Plutarch and of the emperor Hadrian, amazed himself by speaking Greek so well despite his Gallic birth. In the fourth century there flourished Ausonius of Bordeaux, an amiable poet; in the fifth, Rutilius Numantianus, who wrote an itinerary of Rome in verse, and Sidonius Apollinaris, who was at once a poet and a bishop.

Commerce and industry developed more rapidly than the arts and letters. In the time of Augustus, the most flourishing cities of Gaul were found where that land bordered on Italy; by the second century, industrial activity had spread over the land and wealth abounded everywhere. Toulouse eclipsed Narbonne; Nimes, so lavishly endowed by the Antonines with splendid monuments, surpassed the ancient Phocaean city, which had abandoned its stern manners and gave occasion for the proverb, addressed to such as forgot all in the pursuit of pleasure, "You are going to Marseilles." Lyons, the ancient capital, watched the growth of a rival in the city of the Treveri, the chief defence of Gaul against the Germans. Mainz, Cologne, and twenty other cities rose on the banks of the Rhine to protect its passage. Vienne, Autun, and Reims with their schools; Lutetia, which, thanks to its situation, equidistant from Germany and Britain, became the residence of the Caesars

charged with the defence of the two frontiers; Langres and Saintes with their manufactures of *caracallas*, a kind of woollen cloak, which were exported to the whole of Italy; Bordeaux, the chief port for Spain and Brittany; all these serve to exhibit a life which was as vigorous in the centre as on the borders of the land, on the Rhine and Atlantic as on the shores of the Mediterranean.

The language, laws, and arts of Rome took possession of Gaul, but with them came also Roman manners, gross and sensual pleasures, a love of bloody spectacles and of fights between beasts, gladiatorial shows, and appalling moral corruption. Yet Gallic nationality was not entirely stifled under this foreign civilisation. The old Celtic tongue existed, especially in the west in Armorica, in the north in Belgica, on the banks of the Moselle, and even in the centre among the Arverni, where in the fifth century the majority of the nobles still spoke the language of their ancestors. If the language lived, ancient customs were equally preserved. Even druidism, though persecuted by the emperors, did not entirely disappear. Scattered relics of the old creed were long found in the remoter districts, where it may be traced in various superstitions, such as the worship of stones, fountains, fairies, genii, and the like.

Christianity in Gaul.—Augustus had attacked druidism which had been so intimately connected with the struggle for independence. Claudius proscribed the druids, abolished their religion, and imposed the death penalty on those who practised the cult, though this did not prevent the religion from lasting for centuries longer. Its great opponent was Christianity. As early as the second century there were Christians beyond the Alps; Lyons was the chief church of the Gauls, and there the first martyrs suffered.

Towards the middle of the second century some priests of Smyrna, having at their head Potinus, a disciple of St. Polycarp, who had in his youth heard the apostle St. John, arrived in Gaul. Potinus in a few years won a numerous community for the faith and defended with reputation the orthodox faith against heresy. At this time, Marcus Aurelius published an edict against the Christians, and persecution soon began at Lyons. The faithful were brought before the governor and condemned to torture: some, overcome by pain, consented to burn incense before the idols, but the majority faced martyrdom unmoved. Potinus at the age of ninety was stoned by the people. Forty-seven confessors perished in the jaws of the lions or were executed; a woman and a child, Blandine and Ponticus,

before descending into the amphitheatre, satiated the fury of the hangmen (177).

The church of Lyons, momentarily dispersed, was revived by St. Irenaeus, whose knowledge and genius won for him the title of the "Lamp of the West," the "Hatchet of Heresy." He suffered in the persecution ordered by Septimus Severus (212). But the word of Christ had not yet been carried into the rest of Gaul. About A.D. 250, seven bishops set out from Rome to effect this conquest. Paul, Trophimus, and Saturninus in a measure took possession of southern Gaul, establishing themselves at Narbonne, Arles, and Toulouse. Two others, Martial and Gatian, went westwards to Limoges and Tours; one Stremonius, laboured in the rugged mountains of Auvergne; another, St. Denis, on the banks of the Seine at Lutetia. But persecution interrupted their pious work. Saturninus was handed over at Toulouse to the rage of a mad bull. Denis was beheaded on the mountain of Mars (Montmartre) near Lutetia, and buried by the care of a pious woman in the plain which bears his name (St. Denis). The disciples whom they left behind displayed the same zeal and endured like sufferings; at Chartres the first missionaries who came to convert the district were hurled into the wells; at Troyes the confessor Patroclus expired in red-hot chains; at Metz, Clement was forced to make his home and his church in the underground passages of the amphitheatre, and was disturbed when he preached by the roaring of the beasts destined to devour the Christians. Danger redoubled fervour and devotion. Noblemen, sons of senators, such as Quentinus, Crespinus, and Crespinianus, embraced degraded occupations in order that they might have free access to all classes and spread with vigour the Christian creed. A century later, St. Martin resumed and completed the work of St. Denis in the districts of the north.

But already Christianity had ascended the imperial throne with Constantine. In that great revolution, Gaul played a glorious part. She had already had the honour in the second century of defending orthodoxy with energy under St. Irenaeus; the same honour fell to her in the fourth century under St. Hilary, and through the support of the churches of Gaul and Africa the unity of Christianity was maintained against the eastern heresies.

Thanks to the Edict of Constantine, which permitted churches to receive gifts, the temporal power of the clergy grew with their spiritual power, and during the decadence of the empire,

the towns, ill protected by those who should have guarded them, gave to their bishops, under the title of *defensor civitatis*, the chief authority over them.

Political Events: Persecution of the Druids: Florus and Sacrovir.—As early as the reign of Tiberius, it was seen how well Gaul clung to the peace which she owed to the Romans. Julius Florus attempted to raise the Belgae, and Sacrovir to lead the tribes of Celtic Gaul to revolt (21). This rising caused some disquiet at Rome, but the isolation in which its leaders were left showed how slight was the ground for fear. Florus and Sacrovir committed suicide. Caligula exhibited his mad folly to Gaul, while Claudius, who was so severe against the druids, opened the senate to the natives of the province. There are still preserved at Lyons tables of brass on which may be read fragments of the oration which he delivered on this occasion. The revolt by which Nero was overthrown began on the banks of the Saône; the Aquitainian Vindex, governor of Lugdunensis, gave the signal to which all the provinces responded. The empire was violently disturbed, and in two years four emperors received the purple (68–70).

Civilis: Sabinus and Eponina.—As a result of these revolutions, the Batavian Civilis thought that the time had come to break the chain which Caesar had forged. The druids, emerging from their hiding-places in the depth of the woods, announced the fall of the Latin race and the ascendancy of the transalpine nations. A Gaul, Sabinus, assumed the title of emperor. But Vespasian was already at Rome; everything was reorganised under his capable hand; the legions returned to their duty, and Civilis, who had retired to the marshes of Batavia, sued for peace. Sabinus hid his ephemeral majesty in a cavern, where he lived nine years with his wife Eponina. At last he was discovered and brought to Rome, where Vespasian sent him to execution. In vain Eponina threw herself at his knees: "Caesar," she cried, showing him her children, "I conceived and nourished these children in the tombs in order that more suppliants might come to embrace your knees." Those who sat by wept: Vespasian himself gave way to tears, but he was inflexible. Then Eponina rising, demanded that she might share the fate of him whom she could not save. "I shall be happier with him in the shades and under the earth," she said, "than you are in the enjoyment of absolute power." Her prayer was granted; Plutarch met one of her children at Delphi.

The Gallic Caesars (267–273).—For more than a century after

this Gaul played no part in history. In 197 the Battle of Lyons decided the quarrel between Albinus and Septimus Severus, and during the following century the continual revolutions to which the Roman Empire was the prey emboldened the barbarians. Powerful confederacies were formed in Germany, by which the left bank of the Rhine was constantly assailed. In the universal disorder, Gaul remembered Civilus and Sabinus ; and for thirteen years was ruled by emperors of her own. The last of these, Tetricus, weary of power, betrayed his army and surrendered to Aurelian. No sooner had the barbarians heard of the death of that redoubtable prince than they hurled themselves on Gaul and sacked seventy cities. Probus, a second Aurelian, hastened to the province and drove the Germans back into their forests, but the north of Gaul was none the less covered with ruins.

Increasing Misery in the Fourth Century: The Bagaudae.—Under the scourge of these frequent incursions, and the oppressive fiscal system of the empire, that prosperity which the provinces had enjoyed for two centuries constantly declined. Unrest replaced security: commerce and industry were interrupted. Misery spread through the land, and its terrible progress was revealed in the time of Diocletian when the peasants rose under the name of Bagaudae. Maximinian was forced to wage a regular war against them ; he destroyed their entrenched camp near Paris, at the village of St. Maur-les-fossés.

Ravages of the Barbarians: Julian in Gaul.—Constantius Chlorus (or the Pale) governed Gaul mildly and attempted to heal its wounds. His son Constantine, before setting out to conquer Maxentius and Licinius, was careful to give the barbarians a severe lesson, the memory of which led them to keep the peace throughout his reign. Two Frankish chiefs whom he had taken prisoner were thrown to the beasts in the amphitheatre of Treves. But the barbarians were too well acquainted with the roads into Gaul not to enter the province when his restraining hand was withdrawn. Under Constantius II. they reappeared, and to rescue Belgica from the Franks and Alemanni that prince was obliged to send Julian to Gaul. The young Caesar delivered the province from these unwelcome guests. In 357 he defeated seven kings of the Alemanni near Strassburg, while 600 Frank warriors, whom he captured in a castle, after a siege of fifty-four days, were sent by him to Constantius, who enrolled them in his guard. At the same time Julian allowed one Frankish tribe, the Salians, to establish themselves on the banks of the lower Meuse. It was at the imperial palace of Lutetia, the

ruins of which still remain, that Julian was proclaimed emperor by his soldiers (360). He did not again visit Gaul, and after his death the empire was soon divided into the empires of the East and West.

Gaul included in the Share of Honorius (395).—Valentinian, who ruled in the West, and his son Gratian, inspired respect in the barbarians. But while they did not enter the empire as a nation, they invaded the legions as auxiliaries; they received offices and honours. They filled most positions, since, among the degenerate Romans, they preserved their courage, daring, and energy. One of them, Arbogast, a Frank, murdered Valentinian II. near Vienne, and created a puppet emperor, the rhetorician Eugenius (392). Theodosius the Great overthrew alike the protector and his protégé, and for some time reigned over all the provinces. But at his death the empire was finally divided, and Gaul fell to the share of Honorius (395).

CHAPTER V

INVASION OF THE BARBARIANS: THE FRANKS BEFORE CLOVIS (241–481)

Decline of the Empire.—The Roman Empire endured for four centuries, two in honour and prosperity, two in misery and shame. Four hundred years is a short life for an empire. But the emperors had destroyed the vigour of their subjects by a rule of terror, and their dispirited people regarded the threatened destruction of the empire and the approach of the barbarians with the same apathy and indifference as they had displayed in face of the establishment of despotism. At the end of the fourth century, courage and discipline had disappeared from the army, patriotism was unknown among citizens ruined by the constantly increasing exactions of a government which became daily less able to protect its subjects. Nor was Christianity able to check an appalling moral degradation; it even supplied an element which hastened the dissolution of the empire.

The Gauls, denied the use of arms for four hundred years, could no longer wield the sword, and the descendants of the terrible comrades of the *brenns* fled like frightened sheep at the approach of a handful of Germans. Ignorant of the art of defence, they were equally incapable of concerted action. Each man lived for his town, for himself. Lyons was indifferent to the

misfortunes of Treves, Bordeaux to those of Reims, with the result that when the thin line of soldiers guarding the Rhine frontier had been pierced, the barbarians overran the province with impunity. It is easy to imagine the situation when Italy, herself threatened, recalled to her assistance the remnants of her legions, and when the barrier of the Rhine was no longer guarded.

Origin of the Franks.—By the middle of the third century before Christ, the Germans appear to have established on the right bank of the Rhine two formidable confederacies. To the south was that of the Suevian tribes, who called themselves Alemanni (men); to the north of the Salians, Sicambrians, Bructeri, Cherusci, Catti, and other tribes, who took the name of Franks (heroes). The latter are first mentioned by Latin writers in A.D. 241, when the soldiers of Aurelian, then a legionary tribune, being summoned, after defeating a body of Franks, to march to the east against the Persians, sang:—

> Mille Francos, mille Sarmatas semel occidimus,
> Mille, mille, mille, mille Persos quaerimus.

Incursions of the Franks into Africa (256): Established on the Euxine by Probus (277).—In 256 a band of Franks overran Gaul, crossed the Pyrenees, ravaged Spain for twelve years, and finally vanished in Africa. Probus, having retaken the cities of Gaul which the Franks had seized after the death of Aurelian, transported a colony of that people to the Black Sea. But the barbarians soon wearied of this exile; they seized some ships, passed the Dardanelles, and navigated the Mediterranean, ravaging in turn the shores of Asia, Greece, and Africa as far as the pillars of Hercules. Then, having rounded the coast of Spain and Gaul, they rejoined their compatriots on the banks of the Rhine, telling them of the weakness of that great empire which they had traversed with impunity from end to end.

Invasion of Gaul and Establishment on the Meuse under Julian.—As their expeditions had extended so far, the Franks were not likely to refrain from the invasion of the Gallic provinces which lay near them on the left bank of the Rhine. As soon as the Romans relaxed their vigilance, they crossed the river and wasted Belgium. Julian defeated them, but finding that they utterly devastated the banks of the Meuse, he thought it better to abandon the district to them and allow them to repeople it. The Franks were thus the first barbarians to pass the Rhine, the first to be established in Gaul as auxiliaries and allies of the empire. They were the last to found a kingdom.

Arbogast the Frank (392).—Not only did the Franks establish themselves peacefully within the empire, but some of them also rose to the highest positions. When Theodosius, intervening on behalf of Valentinian II., had conquered the usurper Maximus, he gave to the young emperor, as his chief adviser, the Frank Arbogast, who had freed Gaul from the Germans and filled all civil and military posts with barbarians. Valentinian was unable long to endure such tutelage ; he determined to dismiss Arbogast from all his employments. But he declared in the presence of the whole court, " I hold my position from Theodosius, and he alone can dismiss me." Valentinian, in a great rage, fell upon him sword in hand ; some days later he himself was found dead in bed (May 15, 392). Arbogast could not hope that Theodosius would allow this murder to go unpunished, and not daring to proclaim himself emperor, gave the purple to one of his secretaries, the rhetorician Eugenius. The two tried to rally to them the remnants of the pagan party, thus alienating the Christians. A single battle, near Aquileia, sufficed to end their revolt ; Eugenius was taken prisoner and put to death by Theodosius ; Arbogast committed suicide (394).

The Great Invasion (406): Kingdoms of the Burgundians (413) and Visigoths (419).—But the great barbarian invasion followed. Towards the end of 406, while the legions were engaged in Italy against Radagasus, who had invaded the peninsula with 200,000 men, the Suevi, Vandals, and Alans approached the Rhine. The Franks established on the left bank attempted to bar their progress and killed 20,000 Vandals in a great battle. But the allies of the defeated party renewed the attack, the Franks were defeated, and on the last day of the same year the host crossed the river. After ravaging Gaul far and wide, the destroying flood swept over the Pyrenees and descended into Spain. But behind this first horde of barbarians, others hastened to the spoil. The Burgundians under their king Gondicar halted in the east, and Honorius, finding them more pacifically inclined than had been the earlier invaders, granted to them that which in actual fact he could not have prevented them from securing, all the land lying between Lake Geneva and the confluence of the Rhine and Moselle (413).

About the same time, the Visigoths whom Alaric had conducted into Italy from the banks of the Danube were led by his brother Athaulf into southern Gaul. That barbarian became as Roman as he could and attempted to repair the ruin which he had so greatly contributed to cause. He married Placidia,

sister of the Emperor Honorius, overthrew two usurpers who had assumed the purple in Gaul, and undertook for the benefit of the empire the recovery of Spain from the Suevi and Alans. But he was assassinated in Barcelona, and his less disinterested successor Wallia continued the war for his own profit. The Visigoths, lords of Aquitaine as far as the Loire and of the larger part of Spain, thus secured an empire which appeared destined to be permanent and of which Toulouse was the capital.

The Salian Franks: Legendary History of Clodion and Meroveus: Battle of Châlons.—At the time of the great invasion, the Franks had attempted to check the invaders. Having failed to do so, and the empire having abdicated its authority, they resolved to secure some share in the spoil, and shortly afterwards penetrated into the interior of Gaul. Tradition relates that in 428 the Salian Franks were ruled by a certain Clodion, who resided at Dispargum in the district of Tongres. His reputed predecessor, Pharamond, must be dismissed as a wholly mythical character; the accounts of Clodion himself are more than doubtful. He is said to have taken Tournai and Cambrai, killing all the Romans whom he found in those towns. Advancing westwards towards the Somme, he reached Hesdin, where the Franks encamped behind a ring of waggons on some low hills washed by a small stream. Supposing the Romans to be far away, they celebrated the marriage of one of their chiefs; their camp was a scene of festivity, no watch was kept, and on all sides the noise of songs and dances resounded, while within the circle of waggons arose the smoke of the great fires on which meat was being roasted. Suddenly Aëtius appeared. His soldiers advanced in column along a narrow causeway, crossed the stream by means of a temporary wooden bridge, and fell upon the barbarians before they had time to form. Behind the fighting line, the Franks hastily threw into their waggons the materials of their feast, dishes and huge tuns of beer decked with leaves. The barbarians were forced to give way and take to flight; their waggons, with the fair bride, fell into the hands of the conquerors. Clodion did not survive his defeat.

According to tradition, his relative Meroveus succeeded him as chief of the Salians. Three years later the Franks united with all the barbarians cantoned in Gaul and with the remnants of the legions to check the formidable invasion of the Huns.

That people had reached Europe seventy-five years before from the heart of central Asia and filled all men with fear and horror. In character and physique, in their manner of life, they were

entirely divorced from the peoples of the West. Their faces were bony, their eyes mere slits, their expression revolting. Their noses were flat and broad, their ears large and protruding, their complexion yellow, and their hair scanty. "Two legged wild beasts," Ammianus Marcellinus calls them. They crossed the vast Steppes in great waggons or mounted on their tireless ponies, living on the milk of their herds or on a small amount of flesh which they first caused to rot by binding it between their saddles and the sides of their horses.

Such were the men who hurled themselves upon Europe in the second half of the fourth century, throwing the whole barbarian world into confusion and driving it back upon the Roman Empire. When the Goths crossed the Danube, when the Vandals and Burgundians crossed the Rhine, they were alike flying before the Huns. That people halted in central Europe for fifty years and then resumed their march.

Their king, Attila, compelled all the tribes between the Urals and the Rhine to march with him. For a while, he hesitated as to which empire he would visit with the vengeance of Heaven; at last he decided to attack the West, and passing the Rhine, Moselle, and Seine, advanced upon Orleans. In indescribable terror the population fled before him, since, where the "Scourge of God" passed, no stone was left upon another. Metz and twenty other cities were destroyed; Troyes was saved only by its bishop, St. Lupus. Attila resolved to take Orleans, the key of the southern provinces, and a countless host surrounded that town. Its bishop, St. Anianus, maintained the courage of the inhabitants, promising them effective help, and Aëtius approached with all the barbarians already settled in Gaul, whose position was threatened by the Huns. For the first time Attila fell back, but in order that he might give battle where the ground favoured his cavalry, he halted on the Catalaunian Plains, between Méry-sur-Seine and Châlons-sur-Marne. Here a terrible conflict ensued. In a preliminary battle the Franks who formed the advanced guard of the army of Aëtius, and the Gepidae who formed the rearguard of that of Attila, fought with such vigour that 15,000 dead were left on the field. At the close of the battle itself, 165,000 combatants lay dead on the scene of carnage. Attila was defeated. He withdrew into a camp protected by a ring of all his waggons. In the morning, according to the Goth Jornandès, the historian of this war, the victors saw in the centre of the camp a huge pile formed of the saddles of horses, Attila stood upon it, torch in hand, his Huns around him, ready

to convert it into his funeral pyre if the defences were forced. He was a veritable lion, pursued to the entrance of his den by huntsmen, turning and causing them to halt in terror by his roar. The allies did not dare to risk the desperation of the Huns, and allowed Attila to withdraw into Germany. Next year he reasserted his strength by invading upper Italy; but on his return he died from the bursting of a blood vessel, and his empire fell with him, though the dread memory of his name and cruelty survived. The Visigoths, whose king fell in the battle, and the Franks, shared with Aëtius the chief glory of the memorable conflict of the Catalaunian Plains.

The Salian Franks under Childeric.—The mythical Meroveus was succeeded by his almost equally mythical son, Childeric. A story, preserved by Gregory of Tours, relates that the Franks, angered by Childeric's slothful luxury, deposed him and took as their chief a Roman general, Aegidius. Childeric found a refuge in Thuringia, leaving in his own land a faithful friend charged with the duty of conciliating his subjects and winning them back to their former allegiance. A token was arranged by which the king might know when he could return, a gold coin was divided in two, one half being kept by Childeric, the other by his friend. "When I send you my half, you may come back in safety," he said. Aegidius had reigned eight years when the faithful agent of Childeric, having secretly won back the affection of the Franks, sent messengers to his prince with the piece of gold which he had preserved. The king knew from this sign that the Franks desired his return; he left Thuringia and recovered his authority. Some time after, Basina, Queen of Thuringia, came to him, and when Childeric asked the reason which had led her to undertake a journey from so distant a land, she answered, "I knew your merit and your bravery, therefore have I come to you; had I known of any greater man beyond the seas I would have gone to him." Childeric married her, and a son was born who was named Clovis, "a great prince and a renowned warrior."

Childeric died in 481 and was buried at Tournai, where his alleged tomb was discovered in 1653. In it were found a ring, on which was engraved the head of a man with long hair, a stylus for writing, some bees of gold or rather some jewels which had been fastened on a mantle of red silk, the remains of which crumbled to dust in contact with the air, a globe of rock crystal, many Roman coins, and the iron head of an axe.

Chaos in Gaul.—The legendary adventures of this Salian prince

concerned only a small people and a corner of Gaul. After the Battle of Châlons and the dissolution of the temporary league formed against Attila, that country remained for thirty years in a state of anarchy. The empire in the west had fallen in 476 when Odoacer, a Herulian chief, deposed Romulus Augustulus and founded the first barbarian kingdom in Italy. In Gaul this event passed unnoticed, for a Roman general Aegidius, whom Gregory of Tours calls "King of the Romans," held the land between the Loire and the Somme, which no barbarian tribe had yet occupied; he left his power to his son, Syagrius. The cities of Armorica had long ruled themselves independently. The Franks were very numerous in Belgium. The Britons, attacked on their island by Saxon pirates, in their turn pillaged Angers near the Loire. One of the later emperors had ceded to the Visigoths all Gaul south of the Loire and west of the Rhône, and the barbarians had seized Arles, Marseilles, and Aix on the left bank of the river. The Bretons penetrated into Berry, the Franks as far as Narbonne, which they sacked. There was a perpetual coming and going. Tribes hurried pell-mell from north to south, from east to west; all sought fortune sword in hand. The peaceful Gallo-Romans of the towns revived their militia and profited from the universal disorder to settle old disputes. In the midst of the chaos there was heard only the mighty voice of the Church speaking of order to these raging hordes and stretching out her hand to guard the weak. The council of Arles (452) forbade the re-enslavement of freedom for the crime of ingratitude, unless guilt was judicially proved. The council of Orange (441) threatened with ecclesiastical censure those who tried to reduce to slavery men freed by the Church, and forbade the surrender of slaves who had taken sanctuary.

THIRD PERIOD—MEROVINGIAN FRANCE

(481–687)

CHAPTER VI

CLOVIS (481–511)

Gaul in 481.—At the moment when Clovis, son of Childeric, was raised on the shield by the Salians to be their war lord, and the authentic history of the Franks really begins, eight distinct dominions existed in Gaul. Between the Loire and the Pyrenees lay the kingdom of the Visigoths, who also held three parts of Spain, and beyond the Rhône were masters of all the country between the Durance and the sea. The valley of the Saône and of the Rhône as far as the Durance was the dominion of the Burgundians. Between the mouth of the Loire and that of the Seine the Armorican cities retained their independence under native chiefs or municipal magistrates. Between the Mayenne, the middle Loire, and the Somme, Syagrius ruled such districts as still remained to the empire. Between the Vosges and the Rhine, the Alemanni had taken the place of the Burgundians, who had definitely settled further south. A colony of Saxons was established near Bayeux, in sufficient numbers to induce Aëtius to seek their aid against Attila, while some colonists who had come from Great Britain a century before had established themselves in the west of Armorica, where they formed an independent state, the lesser Britain, the name of which was gradually extended over the whole peninsula. Finally all Belgium was in the power of the Franks whose chief rulers resided at Cologne, Tournai, Cambrai, and Terouenne.

It seemed impossible that Gaul could be delivered from this chaos. The kingdom of Syagrius was neither Roman enough nor barbarian enough to endure: it was an incoherent relic. The Armoricans aimed merely at living undisturbed, while the Saxons held only a small part of Gaul and have left not a trace of their settlement. There were, however, three races possessed of a wide extent of territory and able to dispute the control of the whole country.

The Burgundians.—The Burgundians were no longer a savage race; they had come under the softening influences of Latin civilisation and of Christianity. If they could still be described as "barbarians," they had long been in intimate contact with the Roman world. Before the invasion, many of them had settled as traders and merchants in the cities of Gaul, and when imperial authority was destroyed they only seized without violence a third of the land and a third of the slaves in the districts which they occupied. For the Gallo-Romans they had no contempt, nor did they treat them with wounding insolence. The Burgundian code was greatly influenced by Roman law, and was marked by refinements which indicated a gentleness not habitual in the adventurous wanderers of the fifth century. "Whoever," according to the provision of one of these laws, "refuses shelter and warmth to a stranger shall be punished by a fine of three gold pence. If a stranger comes to the house of a Burgundian and demands hospitality, and if the latter then sends him on to the house of a Roman, and this can be proved, the Burgundian shall pay three pence as a fine and three pence as damages to the man whose house he has pointed out." Unfortunately for their tenure of power the Burgundians had been converted to Arianism.

The Visigoths.—The Visigoths were no more terrible. They had been cantoned in the empire for a century, not like the Franks on its frontier, and in a district which constant ravages had restored to barbarism, but in the heart of the richest provinces. Many of the fathers of the tribe had seen Constantinople and all the imposing memorials of Latin civilisation. The court of the Visigothic kings at Toulouse was already distinguished by its elegance and luxury despite the presence in it of numerous barbarians who came there to seek the aid of the mighty sovereign who ruled three parts of Spain and a third of Gaul. "I have waited for two whole moons," says Sidonius Apollinaris, a noble Arvenian, the first poet of the age and afterwards a bishop, "without securing a single audience; the master of these lands has little leisure to spend on me, for the whole world seeks an answer to its petitions, and awaits his pleasure with respect. Here you may see the blue-eyed Saxon, bold at sea, ill at ease on land. Here is the Sicambrian veteran, shorn after a defeat, allowing his hair to grow once more. Here is the Herulian, his cheeks as green as the ocean, on the furthest shores of which he has made his home. Here is the Burgundian, seven feet tall, bending his knee and praying for peace. Here the

Ostrogoth demands the royal patronage to which he owes his power, and by the help of which he caused the Huns to tremble ; proud towards all others, he is meek at the court of Toulouse. Here may you yourself be seen, O Roman, for hither you come to beg for life, and when fresh calamities threaten from the north, you solicit the help of Euric against the hordes of Scythia ; you pray the mighty Garonne to protect the feeble Tiber."

If any one had then tried to discover to what people the inheritance of Gaul would fall, he would not have hesitated to promise eternal dominion to the Visigoths. But that people, despite the courage which they had shown on the field of Châlons, had lost their pristine energy. Moreover, like the Burgundians, they were Arians, with the result that their creed brought them into conflict with their Gallo-Roman subjects. Already the hatred which subsisted between the orthodox and the heretic rulers served to produce on the one hand persecution and on the other secret conspiracies, or at least a desire for and hope of deliverance.

The Franks: Manners and Religion.—" The Franks," says Thierry, " wore reddish hair rolled back on the top of their heads in a kind of tufted knot and falling down their backs like a horse's tail. They were clean shaven, except for long moustaches which hung down on either side of the mouth. They wore linen cloaks, held round the body and thighs by a large belt from which their swords hung. Their favourite weapon was an axe with one or two edges, the iron of which was heavy and sharp, the handle being very short. They began a battle by throwing these axes from a distance either at the face or at the shield of the enemy, and rarely failed to strike the exact mark at which they aimed. Besides the axe, which they called *francisque*, they bore also a species of javelin, peculiar to them and called in their language, *hang*, hook. It was a pike of moderate length, capable of being used either at close quarters or from a distance. The point, which was long and strong, was supplied with numerous hooks or barbs, sharp and bent like fish-hooks. The wood of this weapon was protected with plates of iron for almost its whole length, in such a way that it could not be broken or cut by the stroke of a sword. When this *hang* transfixed a shield, the hooks rendered its extraction impossible ; it remained suspended while its other end dragged on the ground. The Frank who had thrown it then leaped forward, and placing his foot on the javelin, leaned on it with all his weight, forcing his opponent to lower his arm and expose his head and breast.

Sometimes the *hang*, with a rope attached to it, served as a sort of harpoon to drag in whatever it caught. While one Frank hurled this weapon, a second held the rope; the two then united their efforts, either to disarm the enemy or to drag him in by his clothes or armour."

The religion of the Franks was the rude and warlike cult of Odin, the god of Scandinavia. They believed that after death the warrior was received into Valhalla, a palace built in the clouds, the joys of which were eternal battles interrupted only by long feasts, in which beer and hydromel flowed for ever. Each hero drank from the skull of some foe whom he had slain. "The Franks were thus filled with a passionate love of war, as the means by which they might become wealthy in this world and the boon companions of the gods in the world to come. The youngest and most violent sometimes exhibited in battle an access of fanatic frenzy, under the influence of which they appeared to be insensible of pain and to be endued with an extraordinary vitality. They remained standing and fought on, though covered with wounds, the slightest of which would have sufficed to kill any other men." The same warlike fanaticism was afterwards found in the Northmen. An Anglo-Saxon song gives some idea of their blood-drunkenness, this lust of slaughter, which inspired the Franks in battle. "The army moves out to battle; the birds sing, the grasshoppers chirp, the clash of arms is heard. Now the moon wandering through the clouds begins to shine; now comes the hour when tears will flow indeed. Soon the disorder of bloodshed will rage; the warriors drag bloody shields from the arms of their foes; skulls are shattered by the sword. The citadel re-echoes with the noise of blows; crows black and sombre circle round as the willow leaves fall in autumn; the flash of weapons lights up the castle as though it blazed. Never have I heard of battle fairer to behold."

Political Institutions of the Franks: Election of their Kings.—The political institutions of the Franks were those of all the Germanic tribes. Each tribe had a chief whom the Romans called a king, but who possessed neither the power nor the majesty implied by that title. These rulers, like the majority of German rulers, were chosen exclusively from a single family, endowed with a species of religious consecration. Among the Franks this family, from which the kings of all the tribes of the confederation were chosen, was that of the legendary Meroveus. But while the warriors respected this ancient right, they did not regard themselves as bound to absolute allegiance or to implicit

obedience; they were very ready to abandon one Merovingian for another who promised them greater booty.

Popular Assemblies.—"Among the Germans," says Tacitus, "the princes decide upon matters of little moment, while all have a voice in the decision of weightier matters, though the very points which are reserved for the decision of the people are previously discussed by the chiefs. Except in the case of some sudden emergency, they meet on stated days, either at the full or at the change of the moon, which they regard as the most auspicious moment for undertaking any enterprise. In computing time, they do not reckon, as we do, by days but by nights. All their resolutions and summonses to meetings run in this form, so that with them the night seems to lead the day. A certain inconvenience results from this very independence; they do not all assemble punctually at the same time, as if in obedience to a command, but occupy two or three days in gathering an assembly. When the numbers present seem to be sufficient, they sit down armed. Silence is proclaimed by the priests, who have also power to check disorder. Then the king or some other chief distinguished for his age, noble birth, achievements, or eloquence speaks, securing a hearing rather by the power of persuasion than by any weight of authority. If a speech arouses displeasure, they give vent to murmurs; if it is approved, they clash their arms, and this applause of weapons is among them the most honourable expression of assent."

Weakness of the Salian Tribe: Victory of Soissons (486).—In 481, Clovis, the real founder of the Frank empire, only held a part of Belgium, with the title of King of the Salian Franks, who were settled round Tournai. The army at his disposal amounted only to some four or five thousand warriors, and the first five years of his reign passed in an obscurity for which his youth supplies an explanation. At the age of twenty, he suggested a campaign to his men, induced Ragnachaire, King of Cambrai, to join him, and near the old abbey of Nogent, twelve kilometres north of Soissons, the two, at the head of 5000 warriors, defeated Syagrius who fled to the Visigoths. He was afterwards handed over to Clovis and put to death.

Story of the Vase of Soissons.—Considerable spoil was taken after this victory. St. Remigius, Bishop of Reims, who seems early to have entered into friendly relations with Clovis, sought from the king the return of a precious vase which had been taken from one of his churches. When the spoil was set forth, the king,

before it was divided, said, "I ask, my men, that you will give me this vase over and above my share in the spoil." All agreed except one soldier who, striking the vase with his axe, cried, "You shall have nothing except what falls to you by lot." But the others agreed to the king's wish, and Clovis, taking the half broken vase, returned it to the bishop. Next year at the assembly which was held annually in March, Clovis reviewed his army: when he came to the soldier who had struck the vase, he said, "No one has his arms so ill kept as yours." He seized the man's weapons and threw them on the ground. As the soldier bent to pick them up, the king cleft his head with his battle axe, crying, "Thus did you strike the vase a year ago at Soissons." Gregory of Tours adds, "In this way he filled all with a great fear."

This story indicates the rights of a barbarian king, which were at once unlimited and restricted. Clovis, like any one of his soldiers, could obtain only that share of the spoil which fell to him by lot. At the same time he killed a man without trial to avenge a personal injury, and not a murmur was heard. Clearly two contrary ideas were in conflict in the minds of the barbarians; the sacred character of monarchy conflicted with an invincible love of equality, a conflict of ideas which is not peculiar to this period of French history.

Marriage of Clovis and Clotilda (493).—The years which followed the Battle of Soissons were spent in negotiations and wars with the towns between the Somme and the Loire. Clovis was especially anxious to secure control of Paris, and for a long time harassed that city. But St. Geneviève, a holy maiden, whose memory has remained popular in a city where popularity is short lived, was within the walls and maintained the courage of the inhabitants. Another course was given to events by a war with the Thuringians, which called Clovis beyond the Rhine, and by his marriage with Clotilda, niece of Gondebad, King of the Burgundians. Clotilda was a Catholic, and she secured that her firstborn should be consecrated to Christ by baptism. This was an event of the utmost importance. The bishops of northern Gaul, who had doubtless arranged the marriage, hoped for the speedy conversion of the king himself, and the cities of Amiens, Beauvais, Paris, and Rouen opened their gates to the man who had married a woman of their faith.

Battle of Tolbiac: Conversion of Clovis (496).—The Alemanni had long attacked Gaul as the Franks had done, but they occupied only some districts along the Vosges, lands which had been

so often wasted that there was nothing left to be taken from them. Seeing that the Franks had laid hands upon wealthy Roman cities, they wished to secure a share in this spoil, and passed the Rhine in great numbers. The Franks advanced to meet them with Clovis at their head. The conflict was terrible ; Clovis for a moment believed that he was defeated, and in his distress called upon the God of Clotilda. A more violent charge turned the tide of battle ; the Alemanni, driven back over the Rhine, were pursued as far as Suabia, and the people of that land, as well as the Bavarians who inhabited the neighbouring district, recognised the supremacy of the Franks.

The very magnitude of his success convinced Clovis that he must keep his vow. St. Remigius baptised him, and three thousand of his nobles also accepted the Christian faith. As he poured the water on the head of the new convert, the bishop cried, " Bow thy head in meekness, O Sicambrian, adore what thou hast burned, burn what thou hast adored." Then reviving a custom which had existed in the days of the Jewish kings, he anointed him with the sacred chrism.

This baptism and consecration effected little apparent change in the character of Clovis ; in place of calling upon Odin he called upon Christ, but his nature was unaltered. By a curious chance, however, he was the only orthodox prince of that time in Gaul and in the whole of western Christendom. The Gallo-Roman population, oppressed by the Burgundians and the Visigoths, at once fixed their attention and hopes upon the converted chief of the Franks. The whole episcopate of Gaul supported him. Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, wrote to him, " Your faith is our victory ; when you fight, we triumph," and Pope Anastasius declared that the apostolic see rejoiced that God had provided for the safety of the Church by raising up so mighty a prince to protect her.

The Burgundians made Tributary: Defeat of the Visigoths.—The conversion of Clovis alienated some of his followers ; his success, and especially the booty which was to be won under so able a leader, conciliated them. The land between the Loire and the Seine was subdued ; Armorica was won over to the Frankish alliance. Having thus, with a degree of prudence unusual in these barbaric chiefs, established his position in the north, Clovis wished to extend his conquests southwards. He first attacked the Burgundians. Clotilda urged him to this war, that she might avenge the death of her father who had been murdered by Gondebad. King Gondiac, who had died in 463,

had left four sons among whom his dominions had been divided. The eldest, Gondebad, in order to secure the whole inheritance, had killed with his own hand one of his brothers, Chilperic, the father of Clotilda, and had burned another to death. The fourth, Godegisil, still retained his share, but fearing a like fate, secretly appealed to Clovis. Gondebad was defeated near Dijon and fled to Avignon, where Clovis followed him and forced him to pay tribute. The King of the Franks had hardly withdrawn when Gondebad surprised his brother at Vienne and stabbed him in a church to which he had fled for refuge.

After his defeat Syagrius had taken refuge with the Visigoths, who, already fearing a war with the Franks, had given up the fugitive. Later Clovis and Alaric II. had an interview near Amboise. "They spoke with each other," says Gregory of Tours, "ate and drank together, and after promising friendship towards one another, they departed in peace. But all the peoples of Gaul then eagerly desired to be under the rule of the Franks. Thus when a dispute arose at Rodez between the bishop, Quentin, and the citizens, the Goths who inhabited the town were filled with violent suspicion, since the citizens accused Quentin of wishing to bring the place under the rule of the Franks. Having taken counsel, they resolved to kill him. Informed of this design the man of God arose during the night and with his most faithful clergy left the town of Rodez and retired to Auvergne."

It is not known whether the bishops of the south who were thus persecuted called on Clovis to protect them. But one day the king told his soldiers how greatly it annoyed him that the Arians should hold part of Gaul. "Let us march with God's help," he said, "and after conquering them, bring their land under our sway." This suggestion pleased all the warriors, and the army moved on Poitiers, carefully sparing, by the express orders of Clovis, the property of the churches on its line of march. In the legends of the expedition, miracles marked the advance of the Franks. On the banks of the Vienne, a hind of wonderful beauty suddenly appeared from a wood and revealed a ford for which the king was searching. To light the march during the night, a ball of fire blazed from the tower of the church of St. Hilary of Poitiers.

Not far from that city, in the plain of Voulon, the two armies met. The King of the Visigoths with his best soldiers fell on the field of battle. Poitiers, Saintes, and Bordeaux opened their gates to the conqueror; next year he entered Toulouse. The

Visigoths would have lost all their possessions north of the Pyrenees had not the great Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths in Italy, come to their aid. An army which he sent to Gaul defeated the Franks and Burgundians, who had united for the conquest of Provence, near Arles, while, on the other side of the Rhône, Carcassonne made an energetic defence. Septimania, the coast from the Rhône to the Pyrenees, remained to the Visigoths, and the district south of the Durance was annexed by the Ostrogoths.

Clovis, Master of the Greater Part of Gaul.—With the exception of this narrow strip of coast on the Mediterranean, Clovis held the whole country from the Rhine to the Pyrenees, either under his direct rule or through his allies, the Burgundians and Armoricans. A great barbarian kingdom was thus founded in Gaul, a land so naturally fitted to be under a single rule. When Clovis re-entered Tours, he found envoys from Anastasius, the Emperor of the East, who, delighted at seeing the rise of a rival to the great Ostrogoth beyond the Alps, sent to the Frankish king "the ornaments of the consulship." Clovis then assumed the crown and, mounted on his horse, threw gold and silver to the assembled people. From this time he was styled Consul and Augustus. These titles, which were vaguely supposed to have been conferred by the emperor, appeared to legitimatise a position which rested only on force. Clovis, in the eyes of the Gallo-Romans, was no longer a conquering barbarian and a pagan, but an orthodox prince and a Roman Consul.

It was unfortunate for the cause of orthodoxy and for the reputation of the consulate that the change in the character of Clovis was purely nominal; under the *chlamys*, under the catechumen's robe, he still remained a barbarian.

Clovis causes the Death of the Other Frankish Kings.—Clovis established his residence at Paris. "While he was residing in that city," says Gregory of Tours, "he sent secretly to the son of Sigebert, saying, 'Your father is an old man; he is lame, and if he were to die, you would secure his kingdom.' Seduced by the desire thus aroused, Chloderic designed to murder his father. One day Sigebert went out from Cologne, crossed the Rhine, and as he passed through the Buconian Wood, and slept at midday in his tent, he was murdered by assassins sent by his son. Then Chloderic sent word to Clovis, 'My father is dead, and I have his kingdom and treasures in my power; send some of your men to me and I will willingly give you such of my treasures as you may desire.' Clovis answered, 'I thank Heaven

for your friendship and I desire that you will show your treasures to these messengers, and afterwards you shall keep them all.' Chloderic showed his father's treasures to the envoys, and while they examined them, the prince said, 'In this chest my father was used to horde his gold coins.' They answered, 'Put your hand down to the bottom of the chest that we may see how much there is in it.' He did so, and as he bent over the chest one of the envoys raised his axe and shattered his skull. Thus this unworthy son suffered the death which he had inflicted on his father. When Clovis knew that Sigebert and his son were both dead, he went to Cologne, assembled the people, and said to them, 'Hear what has occurred while I was sailing on the Scheldt. Chloderic, my relative's son, troubled his father by telling him that I desired to kill him, and as Sigebert fled into the Buconian Wood, sent murderers who put him to death. He himself, as he opened the treasure chests of his father, has also perished in some manner, how, I do not know. I am not an accomplice in either of these crimes; I could not shed the blood of my relatives, for to do so is forbidden. But since these events have occurred, I give you my advice; take it, if it is acceptable to you. Come over to me and place yourselves under my protection.' The people applauded these words with their hands and lips, and having raised him on the shield made him their king. 'For so God daily increased his kingdom and subdued his enemies under his feet, because Clovis walked with a right heart before Him, and did that which was pleasing in his sight.'

"In his war against Syagrius Clovis had invoked the help of Chararic, King of Therouenne, but he had stood aside, awaiting the issue of the battle that he might ally himself with the victor. Clovis did not forget this and, as soon as he could, entrapped him, took him prisoner with his son, and forced them both to receive the tonsure, ordering that they should be ordained priests. When Chararic was overcome by his shame and wept, his son is said to have answered him, 'Branches which are cut from a tree green and living do not wither but quickly throw out new shoots. Please God he who has done this shall die soon.' The saying was told to Clovis; he believed that they threatened to allow their hair to grow again and then to kill him; he therefore ordered that both should be executed. After their death, he seized their kingdom, their treasures, and their subjects."

"There was still at Cambrai a king named Ragnachaire, who became so violent in his cups that he scarcely spared his nearest

relatives. Clovis had bracelets and belts of gold made and gave them to Ragnachaire's nobles in order to rouse them against him. He then advanced with his army against this chief and defeated him. Ragnachaire's own soldiers handed him with his brother Richaire over to Clovis, their hands bound behind their backs. When Ragnachaire came into the presence of the king, Clovis cried, 'Why have you brought shame on our family by allowing yourselves to be bound? It would have been better for you to have died.' Then raising his hatchet, he cleft his skull. Turning towards Richaire, he said, 'If you had aided your brother, he would not have been bound,' and he killed him in the same way with his axe. After their death those who had betrayed them found that the gold which the king had given them was false. They told Clovis, who replied, 'Such gold is the just reward for one who willingly betrays his master to death,' and added that they should be content that their lives had been spared. These kings were relatives of Clovis. Renomer was also killed by his orders in the town of Le Mans. After their death, Clovis secured their dominions and their treasures."

Clovis, Sole Chief of the Frankish Tribes: His Death at Paris.—"Having killed many other kings, as well as his near relatives, owing to his fear that they might take his dominions from him, he extended his power over the whole of Gaul. It is said that one day he assembled all his subjects and spoke of the relatives whom he had thus brought to their death. 'Woe is me, for I am as a wanderer among strangers, having no relatives should adversity fall upon me.' But it was not that he was grieved at their death; he spoke with guile, that he might discover whether any of his relatives still survived, and if so, might put them to death. When all these events had occurred, Clovis died at Paris where he was buried in the basilica of the Holy Apostles (St. Geneviève), which he had built with Queen Clotilda. He died five years after the Battle of Voulon, at the age of forty-five, having reigned for thirty years."

The first council of the Gallican Church was held in the year of Clovis's death. Among its canons the principle of the regalia may be found, the right of the prince to receive the revenues of a benefice during a vacancy.

CHAPTER VII

THE SONS OF CLOVIS (511–561)

Partition of the Frankish Monarchy between the Four Sons of Clovis.—At the death of Clovis, the state which he had founded included all Gaul except Gascony, into which no Frankish army had yet penetrated, and Brittany, which was ruled by counts, or military chiefs, established at Nantes, Vannes, and Rennes. The Alemanni, in Alsace and Suabia, were rather bound to the fortunes of the Franks than directly ruled by their king. The Burgundians, even before the death of Clovis, had refused the tribute which they had paid for a time, and the cities of Aquitaine, lightly held by Frankish garrisons left at Bordeaux and Saintes, remained practically independent.

The victorious Franks were united only for the purpose of making conquests and taking booty. They were content with expelling the Visigoths from Aquitaine and did not attempt to replace them; as soon as the war was ended, they had returned home to the north with their spoil. Clovis had established himself at Paris, in a central position between the Rhine and the Loire, from which he could easily watch over Brittany, Aquitaine, the Burgundians, and the Frankish tribes of Belgium.

The four sons of Clovis divided their inheritance, and the control of their *leudes*, or vassals, in such a way that each had an almost equal share of the land north of the Loire, in which the Frankish nation was established, and some of the Roman cities of Aquitaine from which a rich tribute was derived. Childebert, King of Paris, held also Poitiers, Périgeux, Saintes, and Bordeaux; Clotaire, King of Soissons, held Limoges; Clodomir, King of Orleans, held Bourges; Thierry, King of Metz, held Cahors and Auvergne.

This curious division contained the seeds of the quarrels which soon broke out, and as owing to the partitions all the provinces became frontier provinces, no one of them escaped pillage and devastation. The old enmities of the Gallic cities were also revived by the partition, and the militia of the towns more than once engaged in bloody combats in the quarrels of their masters.

Conquest of Thuringia and Burgundy.—For some years the impulse towards conquest which Clovis had given continued. Thierry successfully repulsed the Danes who had appeared at

the mouth of the Meuse, and also conquered Thuringia. That land had three kings, Baderic, Hermanfrid, and Berthar. The second of these was married to a villainous wife who sowed the seeds of civil war among the brothers. Under her influence, her husband killed Berthar, but did not dare to attack Baderic. One day at mealtime he found only half his table laid, and when he asked the meaning of this, his wife answered, "It is fitting that a man who is content with half a kingdom should have only half a table." Hermanfrid, aroused by this speech and others similar to it, secretly sent messengers to Thierry in order to persuade him to attack his brother, telling him, "If you put him to death, we will divide his land." Baderic fell by the sword, but Hermanfrid failed to keep his promise to Thierry, and as a result violent hostility arose between them.

"One day," says Gregory of Tours, "having assembled the Franks, Thierry said to them, 'I ask you to remember that the Thuringians attacked your fathers, took from them all that they possessed, and hanged their children to the trees by the sinews of their thighs. They inflicted a cruel death on two hundred young maidens, each of whom they bound by their arms to the necks of two horses, which they then forced by blows of sharp arrows to gallop in opposite directions, so that the girls were torn in pieces. Others were stretched on the roads and fastened to the earth by stakes; heavy waggons were then driven over them, and their crushed remains left as food for dogs and birds.' At these words, the Franks with one voice demanded war against the Thuringians. Thierry took with him as allies his brother Clotaire and his son Theudebert, massacred many of the Thuringians, and brought their land under his rule."

"While the Frankish kings were in Thuringia, Thierry attempted to kill his brother. He caused a curtain to be hung from one wall of the house to the other, concealed armed men behind this, and sent word to his brother that he wished to discuss some important matter with him. But as the curtain was too short, the men's feet showed beneath it, and Clotaire saw them before he entered the room; he accordingly kept his arms and took care that he should be well guarded. Thierry realised that his plot was discovered, but invented some explanation; they discussed various matters, and as he did not know how to give a reason for summoning his brother, he presented him with a large silver dish. Clotaire thanked him for the gift and went away. When he returned to his tent, Thierry complained to his men that he had lost the dish to no profit,

and finally said to his son, 'Go and find your uncle and ask him to give you the present that I have made to him.' The boy went and obtained his request; Thierry was especially skilled in ruses of this kind."

"When he returned home, he persuaded Hermanfrid to visit him, promising him that he should run into no danger, and enriched him with honourable presents. But one day as they were talking together on the walls of Tolbiac, Hermanfrid, pushed by some unknown person, fell from the top of the wall and so gave up the ghost."

Conquest of the Burgundians.—Clovis had reduced the Burgundians to tribute, but Clotilda was still dissatisfied. The death of Gondebad failed to appease her hatred, and one day she said to Clodomir and her other sons, "That I may not have to repent of having nourished you with tenderness, my dearest children, I pray you, be aroused by my wrongs and avenge the death of my father and mother." The Frankish kings, therefore, marched against the two Burgundian kings, Gondemar and Sigismund, the latter of whom had recently caused his son to be strangled in his sleep. The Burgundians were defeated and Sigismund taken prisoner; Clodomir caused him to be thrown down a well with his wife and his other son. But one day, pursuing the enemy with too little caution, he was himself surrounded and slain at Veséronce near Vienne (524).

This defeat served to postpone the conquest of Burgundy, but in 532 Clotaire and Childebert prepared a new expedition and invited their brother Thierry to join with them. The King of Austrasia refused. "If you will not go against the Burgundians with your brothers," his nobles said to him, "we will abandon you and follow them." Thierry had another expedition in view; the people of Auvergne having attempted to withdraw themselves from his rule and to place themselves under that of Childebert, he wished to punish them. "Follow me to Auvergne," he told his men, "and I will lead you into a land where you will be able to take as much gold and silver as you desire, where you can seize herds, slaves, and garments in abundance." Clotaire and Childebert then attacked the Burgundians alone, besieged Autun, and having put Gondemar to flight, occupied the whole land. Meanwhile, Thierry kept faith with his men; he abandoned Auvergne to them and they devastated the land with frightfulness.

Adventures of Attalus.—After his account of these events, Gregory of Tours tells a story which exhibits the manners of the

age and the sad condition of the richest Gallo-Romans, brought against their will into contact with barbarian kings, for whose caprices they often paid with their liberty.

The war of Auvergne produced ill-feeling between Thierry and Childebert. "They were reconciled, and having taken oath not to attack one another, gave mutual hostages in confirmation of their promises. Among these hostages were many sons of senators. New disputes arose between the kings, and their hostages were reduced to slavery and condemned to labour on public works or to become the servants of their gaolers. Several escaped and returned to their native land. Among those who remained in slavery was Attalus, a nephew of St. Gregory, Bishop of Langres. Attalus served a barbarian living in the district of Treves; when Gregory sent servants to search for him, and when they had found him, they offered his master presents. He refused them, saying, 'Considering his birth, I must have ten gold pounds as ransom.' When the servants had returned, Leo, who was in the kitchen of the bishop, said to him, 'If you will allow me to go, I may perhaps deliver your nephew from captivity.' The bishop was delighted at these words, and Leo made his way to the place of which he had been told. His first design was to carry off the boy secretly, but in this attempt he failed. He then said to one of his companions, 'Sell me to this barbarian; you shall have the price which he pays.' The man willingly accepted the offer and sold him for twelve pieces of gold. His new master asked Leo what work he could do. 'I am skilled,' he answered, 'in cooking everything that is eaten at table, and I am not afraid that you will ever find my equal in this accomplishment; when you wish to give the king a banquet, I can prepare royal dishes.' 'Well,' said the barbarian, 'on the approaching festival of the Sun'—for so the barbarians call the Lord's Day—'my neighbours and relations are invited to my house; prepare them a feast which shall cause them to say, "We could not have found a better in the king's palace."' Leo answered, 'Let my master order that I may be supplied with a great quantity of birds and I will perform his command.'

"He was given what he desired. Sunday came and he caused the choicest delicacies to be served. The guests praised the feast highly; the master thanked his servant and gave him authority over all that he possessed, including the duty of supplying food to all who were there. As he took care to please his master in every way, the barbarian placed entire confidence

in him. At the end of a year, Leo went to the field near the house where Attalus guarded the horses, and crouching on the ground far from him, with his back towards him, that no one might see that they were speaking to each other, he said to the young man, 'It is time that we should attempt to return to our own land; I tell you, therefore, to-night, when you have gathered all the horses in the enclosure, do not go to sleep, but when I call you, come, and we will set out.' The barbarian that evening invited to a feast many of his relatives, among them his son-in-law. When they had left the table about midnight, and had withdrawn to their rooms, Leo carried some drink to his master's son-in-law, who as he drank it said, 'Tell me, as you are in the confidence of my father-in-law, when you will be seized with a wish to take horses and return to your own land?' He spoke jestingly and in good humour, and Leo, answering him in the same spirit, laughed and said truthfully, 'That is my plan for to-night, God willing.' The other replied, 'Well, then, I will tell my servant to keep watch that you steal nothing of mine.' They parted laughing. When every one was asleep, Leo called Attalus, and when the horses were saddled, asked if he had arms. Attalus answered that he had only a small lance. Leo entered his master's bedroom and took his shield and spear. The barbarian asked who was there: Leo replied, 'Leo your servant; I am going to make Attalus get up quickly and take the horses to pasture, for he is sleeping like a drunkard.' The barbarian said, 'Do what you will,' and once more went to sleep. Leo, going out again, supplied the young man with arms, and, by the grace of God, found open the gate which, in order to guard the horses, had been fastened at the beginning of the night with bolts driven home by blows from a mallet. They gave thanks to the Lord, and mounting, hastened away with all speed. When they reached the banks of the Moselle, they found men who tried to stop them, but having left their horses and clothes, they crossed the river on planks, and when night came entered a forest where they lay hid. For three days and nights they went forward without finding food; then, by the mercy of God, they found a tree covered with plums and, eating them, gained enough strength to enable them to continue their journey. They entered Champagne, and as they approached Reims heard the sound of horses, and said, 'Let us lie on the ground, that the men who come may not see us.' They threw themselves down behind a great bramble bush, holding their swords ready in their hands. The horsemen halted as they reached the bush, and one said,

'Alas! I shall never find these wretches! But by my faith if I do catch them, one shall be hanged, and I will cut the other in pieces with my sword.' It was their master who spoke; he had come from the city of Reims where he had gone to search for them, and would have found them on his way if night had not hidden them. When he had gone away, they resumed their journey, and entering the town early on a Sunday, went to the house of the priest Paulellus, who was united to St. Gregory by long-standing friendship. Leo gave him his master's name. 'My dream has come true,' cried the priest, 'last night I saw two doves, one white and the other black, which flew and perched on my hand.' They said to the priest, 'God will forgive us though we eat before matins on his day. We beg you to give us some food, since this is the fourth time that the sun has risen since we last tasted any bread or cooked food.' The priest gave them bread soaked in wine; then he hid the two youths and went to matins. Meanwhile the barbarian had found their track: he followed Paulellus to the church, but the priest deceived him and he went away. The young men lived for two days in this house, and then, having regained their strength, set out to rejoin Gregory. The bishop, rejoiced to see them, wept on the neck of his nephew Attalus; he freed Leo and all his family from the yoke of servitude, giving him lands on which he lived as a free man for the rest of his days with his wife and children."

Wars against the Visigoths and Ostrogoths: Expeditions across the Alps (539) and the Pyrenees (542).—Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths, the mighty master of Italy, who had already checked the advance of Clovis, in 523 annexed Valais from the Burgundians, and Rouergue, Vivarais, and Velay from the Franks. But he died (526), and the Franks, taking the offensive, ravaged Septimania (531). This province, nevertheless, remained in the hands of the Visigoths who held it for two hundred years, and it was through this gate in the Pyrenees that the Arabs entered Frankish territory. In 533 the Austrasians recovered Rouergue, Velay, and Gévaudan; three years later, Witigis, King of the Ostrogoths, ceded Provence to the Franks in order to gain their help against the Byzantines. Thudebert, who succeeded his father, Thierry, in 534, as King of Austrasia, led a large army into Italy, defeating in turn the Goths, who had bribed him to enter the peninsula, and the Byzantines. Disease decimated his host, but the number of dead did not trouble the Franks; they considered only the booty to be gained, and they could plunder where they would (539). So rich was the spoil

won by Thudebert on this expedition that Childebert and Clotaire could only retain the loyalty of their vassals by promising them an equal booty from an attack on Spain. They crossed the Pyrenees and captured Pampeluna. But they were checked before Saragossa, and on their homeward march sustained a defeat (542).

Violent Deaths of almost all the Frankish Princes (524–558).—In those days princes did not grow old; they died young as a result of their excesses even when they escaped the murderous hands of relatives. Of the four sons of Clovis, Clodomir, King of Orleans, was first killed (524), falling, however, by the hand of an open enemy. He left three sons, who were protected by their grandmother, Clotilda. One day Childebert sent secretly to his brother Clotaire, saying, "Our mother keeps with her our brother's sons, and wishes to hand over the kingdom to them; come quickly to Paris that we may decide whether we will cut their hair, in order to reduce them to the level of the rest of our subjects, or whether we will kill them in order that we may divide our brother's inheritance." Greatly delighted by this message, Clotaire went to Paris. Childebert had already spread a report that the two kings had agreed to place the boys on their father's throne, and he next sent messengers to his mother, in the name of himself and his brother, saying, "Send the children to us, that we may raise them to the throne." She was filled with joy, and being ignorant of their craft, sent the children, after having feasted them, saying to them, "I shall cease to believe that I have lost a son when I see you succeed to his kingdom." As soon as the boys had set out, they were seized and parted from their servants. The kings then sent Arcadius to their mother with a pair of scissors and a sword. He came to the queen and showed them to her, saying, "Your sons, my masters, most glorious queen, wish to know in what way the children should be treated; decide whether their hair shall be cut and they be spared, or whether they shall be killed."

Dismayed by this message, and at the same time driven to extreme anger, the queen allowed her wrath to carry her away, and not knowing what she said in her grief, rashly answered, "If they are not to be placed on their throne, I would rather see them dead in their graves." Arcadius was little disturbed by her grief, and did not trouble to discover her true opinion; he returned quickly to those who had sent him, and told them that they could complete the work which they had begun, with the queen's approval. Clotaire at once seized the elder child by

the arm and threw him on the ground, stabbing him in the armpit. The other, at his brother's cries, fell at the feet of Childebert, saying with tears, "Help me, most pious father, that I may not die like my brother." Childebert was touched, and said to Clotaire, "My dearest brother, I beg you to grant me his life; if you consent not to kill him, I will pay what ransom you may demand." But Clotaire loaded him with abuse: "Drive the boy from you, or you shall certainly die in his place; you suggested to me that I should undertake this; you are quick to go back on your resolve." At these words, Childebert drove away the child, and threw him to Clotaire, who stabbed him in the side and killed him. Their servants and guardians were also slain, and when they were dead, Clotaire mounted his horse and rode off, without troubling in the least about the murder of his nephews. The queen had their bodies brought to her on a litter, and bore them with many pious chants and great sorrow to the church of St. Peter, where the two were buried together. The elder was ten years old, the younger was seven.

They failed to take the third child, Clodoald, who was saved by the help of some brave soldiers. Despising an earthly kingdom, he dedicated himself to God, cut his hair with his own hands, and became a clerk. He persisted in good works, and died a priest, being eventually canonised as St. Cloud.

At the death of Thierry (534), Clotaire and Childebert would gladly have treated his son Theudebert as they treated the sons of Clodomir. But he was already of age, and being also brave and popular with his men was able to protect himself. He was the most active and brilliant of the Merovingian princes. After his remarkable expedition into Italy, he meditated an attack on Constantinople, and it is impossible to guess what would have occurred if, turning the tide of invasion which had flowed from east to west for a century and a half, he had drawn from the midst of the west and hurled upon New Rome the disorderly and mighty host of the Germanic nations. But he was killed hunting. Some time before, his wife, Deuteria, jealous of the beauty of her own daughter, had placed her in a waggon drawn by wild bulls, by which means she was hurled from the top of a bridge and drowned in the river.

Theudebert died in 547; his son Theudebald died at the age of fourteen in 553, Clotaire seizing his inheritance. The new King of Austrasia had soon to deal with an attempted revolt of the Saxons, who refused to pay their tribute of five hundred cows. "As he advanced against them with his army, they came

to him with offers of submission, but his soldiers obliged him to drive them away without an answer. They returned, and offered half of all they possessed, and Clotaire, addressing his vassals, said, 'Abandon your project, I beg you, for right is not on your side; if you are absolutely resolved on entering into battle, I will not follow you.' In anger, his vassals threw themselves upon him, destroyed his tent, loaded him with abuse, and forcibly seizing him wished to kill him. He then went with them to the battle, but the Franks were defeated." This story gives a clear indication of the manners of the Franks and their untamed spirit, and helps to explain the degradation which successively fell upon the two dynasties of the Merovingians and Carolingians.

Clotaire I., Sole King of the Franks (558–561).—Childebert, King of Paris, died in 558, and Clotaire, acquiring his inheritance also, was left as sole King of the Franks, reigning for three years over the whole monarchy of Clovis. His son, Chramm, had formed a plot against him with Childebert. On his uncle's death, he fled for refuge to Brittany; his father pursued him, defeated the Bretons who tried to defend him, and, having taken him, left him bound with his wife and children in a peasant's hut which he set on fire.

He only survived his son for a year, dying in his manor of Compiègne, where he often stayed, in order to enjoy in the great forest which surrounded it those long hunting expeditions which so greatly delighted the first Merovingians. When death approached, this barbarian, struck by grief, felt that he was conquered at last: "What manner of king is this King of Heaven," he cried, "who causes even the greatest kings of the earth to perish?"

St. Radegonde.—Among the wives of Clotaire there was one whose history gives us a little respite from all those stories of bloodshed. Radegonde was the daughter of that Berthar, King of Thuringia, who had fallen under the blows of his brother. She had herself formed part of a booty taken by Clotaire. That prince, struck by her extreme beauty, educated her with care and at a later date made her his wife. Radegonde viewed with horror the marriage which made her a queen. In her mind she dwelt ever in the midst of her murdered family; she forgot them only when she stripped herself of the pomp of her position to live in the midst of the poor, to minister to their needs and tend their revolting wounds; when she listened to some learned clerk or when she talked long with some bishop of the Holy Scriptures. "She is a nun, not a queen," said Clotaire brutally.

The cloister was in truth the asylum to which this tender and loving soul wished to escape from the gross passions by which she was surrounded. One day, when the king had caused her last surviving brother to be murdered, she hastened to Noyon and found the Bishop St. Medard at the altar. "I beg you, most holy father," she said, "to consecrate me to the Lord." There was reason to fear the heavy anger of the king; the bishop hesitated, since the church was full of Frankish soldiers, who threatened him. But the queen at once assumed the garb of a nun, and called upon him to give to God that which she wished to withdraw irrevocably from the world; and he consecrated her a deaconess by the laying on of hands.

Clotaire was enraged. Defeated at last by the patient opposition of the bishops, he allowed his wife, the daughter of the Thuringian kings, to found a monastery for women at Poitiers, of which she became the abbess. She entered it in 550, never to leave it again until her death thirty-seven years later. During this long seclusion, she devoted herself always to good works, and mingled the study of letters with strict religious observances. She ever cherished loving memories of her home, and the chief poet of the period, Fortunatus, who was ordained a priest in order that he might not leave her, has handed down her thoughts to us in his bad verse.

Human nature never loses its rights; in the midst of the most unbridled passions, pure and delicate feelings will yet be found. In the sixth century, it was the Church that offered a refuge to those gentle and lofty spirits whom the growing barbarism appalled. The cloister existed for those who sought peace and solitude; the ranks of secular clergy afforded scope for such as would exercise more active virtues, and for those who did not fear to speak to these bloodthirsty men of peace, of justice, and of love. Thus the worst periods of the Middle Ages preserved a morality superior to that of the best days of paganism, and humanity made progress even when it seemed to be cast down into a veritable abyss.

CHAPTER VIII

THE SONS AND GRANDSONS OF CLOTAIRE I. (561-618)

New Division in 561.—After the death of Clotaire I. (561), the monarchy was again divided into four kingdoms, those of Paris, Soissons, Metz, and Burgundy. The premature death of Caribert, King of Paris, reduced their number to three in 567. The division which followed was more enduring than those which had preceded it, since it corresponded with natural lines of partition and with distinct nationalities. Gontran ruled the Burgundians, Sigebert the Austrasians or eastern Franks, and Chilperic that mixed Frankish and Gallo-Roman people which was known as the Neustrians or western Franks. Aquitaine remained divided between the three kings, each of whom wished to have a share in the fair districts of the south and in those wealthy cities, the tribute of which filled their treasuries. Paris had already attained such importance that it could not be left to one of the brothers; it was decided that it should belong to all three, but that no one of them should enter the town without the permission of the other two.

Of these three kings, Gontran was the least distinguished but the longest lived; he witnessed the bloody catastrophies of which the other kingdoms were the scene.

Fredegar, a chronicler of the seventh century, has preserved the following popular story of this period. "One night as Childeric, father of Clovis, lay beside his wife, Basina, she said to him, 'Arise, O King, and tell your servant what you see passing through the courtyard of your palace.' Childeric rose, and saw beasts which resembled lions, unicorns, and leopards. He came back to his wife and told her what he had seen, and Basina answered, 'Master, go again, and tell your servant what you see.' Childeric rose a second time, and saw beasts like bears or wolves. Having told his wife this, she sent him a third time, when he saw dogs and other smaller beasts, which fell upon and tore each other. Then Basina said to Childeric, 'That which you have seen will truly come to pass. A son will be born to us who will be like a lion in courage; his sons will be like unicorns and leopards, but will in their turn have sons like bears and wolves in their greed. Those whom you saw last will come at the end, and accomplish the ruin of the kingdom.'"

On this occasion, popular fancy was justified; the history of the lion, of the unicorns and the leopards has been recorded, and the narrative now passes on to the ravening bears and wolves. Under the sons of Clovis, the spirit of conquest still filled the Franks; after their death, for a century and a half, the spirit of discord ruled supreme.

Rivalry of Neustria and Austrasia: Fredegonde and Brunhilde.—Nearer the Rhine, across which the barbarians had advanced westwards, Austrasia (Belgium and Lorraine) was filled with a very large Frankish population. Germanic customs prevailed, and a crowd of petty chieftains formed a powerful and warlike aristocracy, which was jealous of the kings. Neustria (Ile de France, Normandy, etc.) was more Roman because it contained a smaller barbarian element and more ancient cities; it accepted the authority of its kings, and preserved some memories and some traces of imperial administration. This divergence in manners and situation produced political hostility between Neustria and Austrasia, which burst forth in the rivalry of Fredegonde, wife of Chilperic, and Brunhilde, wife of Sigebert, and at a later date in that of Ebroin with the Austrasian mayors of the palace.

Invasion of the Avars and Lombards (562–576).—A new people, coming from Asia by the route which the Huns had followed, had penetrated into the valley of the Danube, which they ascended to hurl themselves against the Frankish empire. Sigebert, whose duty it was as King of Austrasia to defend the eastern frontiers, at first defeated the Avars (562), but six years later they advanced into Bavaria and Franconia, defeated Sigebert, and made him prisoner. Their victory appears, however, not to have been very decisive, since they released their captive and retired into Pannonia. At the same time, the Lombards, who had a few years earlier made themselves masters of Italy, penetrated to the banks of the Rhône (570–576). But the Franks retained too much of their primitive vigour for their new dominion to be so soon destroyed. The Lombards were driven back over the Alps, as the Avars had been expelled from the Germanic lands.

Murder of Galswintha (568).—While the King of Austrasia fought for the common cause, his brothers profited by his absence to pillage his western provinces. To this wrong, Chilperic added another, causing his wife Galswintha, sister of Brunhilde, to be strangled. These two women were daughters of Athanagild, King of the Visigoths, who by this double marriage

alliance had hoped to purchase the friendship of the Franks. Brunhilde, a woman of virile mind, had agreed without reluctance to her marriage with a king whom the Visigoths, softened by the mild climate of Spain, regarded as a barbarian. But Galswintha, less desirous of power, saw with terror the coming of the day when she would be obliged to leave her mother and to seek an unknown husband in the north. The ablest historian of this period has told, following the contemporary poet Fortunatus, the touching story of this wedding, and has painted the portrait of this gentle maiden, so unlike the barbarous age in which she lived. "When the Frankish ambassadors presented themselves to greet their king's betrothed, they found her weeping on her mother's breast, and rough as they were, were so moved that they did not dare to speak of departing. They allowed two days to pass, and on the third appeared before the queen, telling her this time that they must hasten their departure, and insisting on the impatience of Chilperic and the length of the journey. The queen with tears begged one more day's delay for her daughter. 'One day more, and I will ask nothing else; you know that where you are taking my daughter she will have no mother.'" But all possible excuses for delay were exhausted; Athanagild interposed his royal and paternal authority, and despite the grief of her mother, Galswintha was handed over to those who were to conduct her to her future husband. "A long file of horsemen, carriages, waggons, and baggage carts passed through the streets of Toledo, and moved towards the north gate. The king accompanied his daughter as far as a bridge over the Tagus, some distance from the city, but the queen could not bring herself to return so quickly, and went still further. Leaving her own carriage, she sat beside Galswintha, and stage after stage, day after day passed, until a hundred miles had been traversed. Each day she said, 'This day must see the end of my journey,' and then having reached the end of that stage still did not turn back. When they drew near the mountains, the roads became difficult, but the queen disregarded this, and would have gone even further. As, however, her escort greatly increased the numbers of the party, and this augmented both the difficulty and the danger of the journey, the Gothic nobles determined to allow her to go only one mile more. She was forced to submit to the inevitable parting, and new though calmer scenes of tenderness occurred between her and her daughter. The queen expressed in gentle words her sadness and her motherly fears. 'Be happy,' she said, 'but I

tremble for you ; take care of yourself, my daughter, take great care.' At these words, which corresponded only too nearly with her own presentiments, Galswintha wept. ' It is the will of God, and I must submit,' she said. Thus the sad parting took place."

" The numerous escort was split up ; horsemen and carriages were divided into two parts, some continuing on their way, the rest turning back to Toledo. Before entering the carriage which was to bear her home, the Gothic queen stood upright and immovable by the side of the road, and fixing her gaze upon her daughter's carriage, did not cease to watch her until it had disappeared in the distance behind a curve in the road. Galswintha, sad but resigned, continued her northward journey. Her escort was composed of nobles and warriors of the two nations, Goths and Franks ; it crossed the Pyrenees, passed through Narbonne and Carcassone, without having left the Visigothic realm which extended so far. Then it went by way of Poitiers and Tours to Rouen, which had been fixed upon as the place of the marriage. At the gates of each important town a halt was made and a solemn entry prepared. The horsemen threw off the cloaks which they wore on the journey, uncovered the harness of their horses, and assumed the shields which hung at their saddle-bows. The destined bride of the King of Neustria left her heavy travelling coach for a state carriage, constructed in the form of a tower and entirely covered with plates of silver.

" The nuptials of Galswintha were celebrated with as much magnificence and display as those of her sister Brunhilde. Honours unusual for a bride of this period were granted to her, and all the Neustrian Franks, nobles, and commoners swore fealty to her as to a king. Standing in a semicircle, they drew their weapons simultaneously, and brandishing them in the air repeated an old pagan formula which gave to the edge of the sword any one who violated this oath. Afterwards the king solemnly renewed his promise of constancy and conjugal faith ; placing his hand upon a casket containing relics, he swore that he would never repudiate the daughter of the Gothic king, and that while she lived he would never take to him any other woman."

For some months he kept his word ! Before her coming, Galswintha had a rival, Fredegonde, whose very name recalls all the bitterness and implacable cruelty there has ever been in a woman's heart. For a time, the arrival of the Gothic princess drove her back into that obscurity from which she had emerged, but she soon regained her former ascendancy over

Chilperic. Galswintha dared first to complain, and then to demand that she might return to her own land; Chilperic feared the loss of the treasure which formed her dower, and one night a faithless servant, entering her chamber, strangled her while she slept.

Murder of Sigebert (575).—Brunhilde wished to avenge her sister at once, and urged her husband to war. But Gontran interposed; the matter was referred to the decision of the popular assembly and sentence was given that Chilperic should hand over to Brunhilde five cities of Aquitaine which he had on the morrow of his wedding assigned as the dower lands of Galswintha. In 573 he tried to revoke this cession, and invaded the territories of Sigebert in Aquitaine. The King of Austrasia hurried to their defence, followed by a vast army drawn from beyond the Rhine which made his expedition seem like a new invasion. Chilperic in alarm made further concessions, but no sooner had Sigebert dismissed his savage levies than new provocations recalled him to Neustria. This time the Austrasian resolved to make an end of his brother. Nothing checked him; he entered Paris, and the Neustrians promised to accept his rule. Chilperic only preserved Tournai; Sigebert wished to take this from him. At the moment of his departure on this expedition he was met by a holy man, Germain, Bishop of Paris, who tried to drive from his heart the evil design which had been formed in it. "King Sigebert," said the bishop, "if you go forth with no design of killing your brother, you will return alive and victorious, but if you have any other thought, you will die, for the Lord has said, 'The pit which you dig for your brother you shall fall into the midst of it yourself.'" Sigebert did not answer; he received at Vitry the plaudits of the Neustrians who proclaimed him king, and then advanced against Tournai. But Fredegonde watched over her husband and herself; two soldiers, seduced by her charms, appeared at Vitry, where they demanded to see Sigebert and to speak with him privately. As he listened to them, one standing on either hand, they both stabbed him in the side with long poisoned daggers. He never uttered a cry as he fell dead, and Chilperic was saved (575).

Murder of Chilperic and Two of his Sons (584).—Brunhilde being then at Paris with her treasures and her infant son, afterwards Childebert II., was at the mercy of Chilperic. The King of Neustria seized the treasures and troubled little about the child. One of Sigebert's men made his way into the palace where the prince was imprisoned, hid him in a great basket, and allowing himself

to slide down a rope from the height of the walls, took the child to Metz by devious paths. Childebert was five years old; the nobles none the less proclaimed him king, giving him a mayor of the palace to rule in his name. This minority favoured their wish for local independence.

Meanwhile Fredegonde struck terror into Neustria by her murders. Her husband had two sons by his first marriage, Merovius and Clovis, whose rights were superior to those of her own son, Clotaire. Merovius was rash enough to marry Brunhilde; his step-mother seized the occasion to produce a quarrel between him and his father, and persecuted him with such bitterness that the wretched youth either committed suicide or was murdered by one of the queen's minions. His friends perished in horrible tortures. The Bishop of Rouen, who had performed the marriage, was himself murdered on the steps of the altar as he offered the sacrifice of the mass. Clovis fell later, as did one of his sisters and his mother Audowere.

The vision of the bishop thus came true: "After the synod of Paris," relates Gregory of Tours, "I had already said adieu to the king, and was ready to return home. But not wishing to go without greeting the Bishop of Albi, I went to find him, and did so in the courtyard of the manor of Braine. We went apart a little to talk with each other, and he said, 'Have you seen under this roof that which I have seen?' 'I have seen,' I answered, 'a second small building which the king has lately built under it.' 'Have you seen nothing else?' he asked. 'No,' I replied, and supposing that he spoke figuratively, I added, 'If you have seen anything else, tell me.' Then, sighing deeply, he said, 'I see the sword of God's anger drawn and suspended over this house.' And truly the words of the bishop were not false."

Chilperic himself was possibly one of the victims of Fredegonde. One evening on his return from hunting to his manor of Chelles, as he dismounted, resting one hand on the shoulder of one of his nobles, he was stabbed by Landeric, one of the queen's servants. Others accused Brunhilde of this crime (584).

This prince, whom Gregory of Tours calls a Nero and a Herod, none the less displayed in the midst of all his vices and barbarity a certain instinct for government and some literary tastes. He made verses, and though they were certainly poor, it must be concluded that he read the poets whom soon no one read at all. He admired the administrative order which the emperors had established, even though it is true that he borrowed

from them, especially their financial system. "King Chilperic," says Gregory of Tours, "caused rolls of new and very burdensome taxes to be prepared throughout his kingdom, with the result that many left their towns and abandoned their possessions. It was ordained that every proprietor should pay a pitcher of wine for every half acre of land. On other lands and on slaves many other contributions or levies were imposed which it was impossible to bear." By frequent revolts the people protested against this voracious financial system, a return to that which had destroyed the old empire. But it required family troubles and the death of many of their children to persuade the king and Fredegonde that the anger of Heaven had fallen on their house owing to these taxes: they then caused the rolls to be burned.

King Gontran.—But these murders alarmed the easy-going Gontran. "To put an end to this evil custom of killing kings, he went one day to the church where all the people were assembled at mass. Having had silence proclaimed by a deacon, he said, 'I adjure you, men and women who are here present, preserve unbroken faith towards me, and do not kill me as you have lately killed my brothers. Grant me three years in which to educate my nephews, lest after my death you and they will perish together, there being no man of my family strong enough to defend you.' At these words, all the people prayed to the Lord."

Between Fredegonde and Brunhilde, Gontran had reason to tremble. The former had entrusted him with the care of her son, the young Clotaire II., but he felt that he was surrounded by dangers on all sides. He feared Fredegonde, he feared Brunhilde, who had returned to Austrasia, where she secured complete ascendancy over her son. He feared the nobles who were daily more disinclined to submit to royal control. Presently a great plot was organised in the south. Aquitaine, which had remained wholly Roman, attempted to separate from the barbarous lands of the north and to create a king for itself, Gondowald. This adventurer, a reputed son of Clotaire I., perished after almost succeeding in his design (585).

Treaty of Andelot (587).—Another and more formidable plot was secretly formed among the nobles of Austrasia and Burgundy (587). They proposed to assassinate the two kings and then to divide the country. One of the assassins, captured as he was about to stab Gontran, revealed the plot. The conspirators perished, and among them a number of dukes and

counts. Childebert and Gontran, in alarm, had an interview at Andelot (in Haute-Marne, 20 kilometres north-east of Chaumont) in order to settle their differences. It was decided that the inheritance of either, if he died childless, should pass to the survivor, that the vassals should not be permitted to transfer their allegiance at will from one king to another, but on the other hand should be granted security of tenure in their lands. This was a first step towards the establishment of feudalism.

Power of Brunhilde in Austrasia and in Burgundy.—Gontran died in 593, and Childebert II., having united the two kingdoms, tried to seize that of Clotaire II., son of Fredegonde. His troops were defeated at Doissy near Soissons, and before he had time to recover from this reverse, sickness carried him off (596). His eldest son, Theudebert II., took Austrasia; the younger, Thierry II., took Burgundy. Brunhilde hoped to rule Austrasia in the name of her grandson as she had ruled it in the name of her son, but she had angered the Austrasians by attempting to introduce order into the state and to reduce the vassals to greater obedience. Feeling that she was hated by the nobles, she tried to preserve her power over her grandson by encouraging him to give way to every kind of excess. She was punished for this abominable scheme; those who shared in the young king's debauches expelled her (589).

Retiring to Burgundy to her other grandson, she continued to feel the same lust for power, though it is fair to add that with her imperious ambition there were mingled loftier views than those of the contemporary princes. She had a taste for arts and letters; unlike the rest of these Merovingians, she believed that a king should not merely enjoy the taxes paid by his subjects, but owed them in return the maintenance of good order and the undertaking of public works. She built churches, constructed roads, and recalled the memory of that Roman administration which she wished to restore. Unfortunately she considered that the end justified the means, and especially that it justified the favourite method of the time, assassination, by which all difficulties seemed to be so easily removed. Thus she caused St. Didier, Bishop of Vienne, to be stoned, because he tried to reclaim her grandson from those vices in which she encouraged him. She did not dare, however, to lay hands on St. Columbanus, an Irish monk, whose eloquence was equal to his courage, and who traversed Gaul recalling monks to their duty, and sometimes moving princes to humanity. As he vigorously reproached Thierry II. for his irregularities, she expelled him

from the monastery which he had founded at Luxeuil, in the midst of the wilds of the Vosges, and forced him to take ship on the Loire and return to his own land.

In the midst of these court intrigues, wars occurred between the peoples. The Neustrians were twice defeated by the Austrasians, at Droissy, near Soissons (593), and at Latofao, near Moret (596); they were utterly crushed by the Burgundians at Dormeilles, in Gatinais (600), and near Étampes (604), and Paris was taken. Clotaire II. was only saved by the King of Austrasia who negotiated with him. Brunhilde, furious at seeing a vengeance which she had pursued for twenty years escape from her, turned upon Theudebert. She persuaded Thierry to attack him, but his vassals refused to fight. In 610 war did break out between the two, and Theudebert, defeated, was put to death with his children; his brother hardly outlived him (613).

Plot of the Nobles against Brunhilde: Her Terrible Death (613). —No grown males were left to reign in Austrasia: there were only four children and their great-grandmother Brunhilde. The nobles were disturbed at the thought of being at the mercy of this imperious woman, and a plot was secretly organised against her. She despatched the armies of her two realms against Clotaire II., and counted on a certain victory, but was delivered by her own soldiers into the hands of the son of her implacable enemy. He charged her with having caused the death of ten kings, handed her over for three days to the insults of his army, and then bound her to the tail of a wild horse. The four sons of Thierry II. had already been murdered, and Clotaire II. found himself, as his grandfather and namesake had done, sole King of the Franks (613). The horrible Fredegonde, his mother, had already died "full of years" in 597.

CHAPTER IX

STATE OF GAUL IN THE SIXTH CENTURY

Disorder and Gloom of the Period. — Mankind has passed through few such unhappy periods as the sixth and seventh centuries of the Christian era. The indiscipline and brutal violence of the barbarians, the absence of all order, the revival of old quarrels between town and town, district and district, and above all a species of return to the state of nature, may be

traced clearly in the writings of this unhappy age. Men lived in constant dread of pillage and arson, of unexpected attacks and murder. Over and above the evil resulting from violence, there was thus a feeling of perpetual unrest from the expectation of further violence, the barbarians having as little scruple in taking the liberty as in appropriating the goods of the conquered. When Chilperic sent his daughter to Spain to marry the King of the Visigoths he took from Paris a great number of its inhabitants of high rank, whom he compelled, whether they would or no, to leave their homes and families to form an escort for the princess. Every year these barbarian kings made war; every year they made peace. The number of hostages thus constantly increased, and it was always the sons of wealthy Gallo-Romans who were reduced to slavery on each side directly a rupture occurred. The history of one such hostage, Attalus, has already been recorded.

To complete the picture of these dreadful days, it may be added that the development of civilisation entirely ceased; that the Latin language was corrupted in these barbarous lips; that neither kings nor chiefs, no one not engaged in the service of the Church or in municipal administration, troubled to learn to read or write. Civilisation declined, and seemed to be on the point of vanishing beneath the ruins caused by the barbarians.

Fredegar, who continued the historical labours of Gregory of Tours, recognised with sorrow the growing progress of barbarism. The pious bishop was himself uncultured, and asked pardon for his errors of style, but he had at least the spirit of learning. "I pray," says Fredegar, "that a portion of like eloquence may have fallen to me and that I may be in some measure like him. But it is hard to draw water from a dry well. The world grows old, the sword of wisdom is blunted; no one now living can emulate the orators of bygone ages; none dare attempt to do so."

Three Forms of Society in Gaul.—When the invasion had passed over Gaul, shattering its ancient bonds and introducing new political and social ideas as it filled the country with new races, three classes of society are to be found existing, of which one served as a link between the other two: the Gallo-Romans, the barbarians, and between them, recruited from each, the Church.

The Clergy: Importance of the Position of the Bishops.—The Church had met the barbarians half way; she overcame her conquerors, drew them to the foot of the altar, and forced them to bow their heads before her word and beneath her hand. But

from contact with barbarism, she herself acquired a certain element of ruthlessness. Germans and Franks aspired to the honours of the episcopate and introduced into her churches manners hitherto unknown in them. The great intellectual movement which had formerly inspired religious society was interrupted and ceased; darkness fell upon the Church herself. But the clergy still preserved some traces of ancient culture, some literary instinct, and if clerical wisdom declined, clerical influence increased in the cities, where the bishop was the true ruler; over the kings, who drew their ablest advisers from the ranks of the clergy; over the nobles, who purchased her prayers by lavish donations, preferring to do penance by giving lands to the Church rather than by setting a good example to their men. Armed with the power of excommunication, the bishops could inspire the most violent of men, even kings, with salutary fear, and they added material to moral power when they secured from Clotaire I. or Clotaire II. the right to hear, concurrently with the count or governor of the city, cases of theft, treason, and arson.

The intervention of the clergy in secular affairs was fortunate; their courts were superior to those of the barbarian in intelligence, impartiality, and humanity. They were, indeed, the leaders of civilisation, and the eighty-three councils held in Gaul from the beginning of the sixth to the middle of the eighth century testify not only to the practical activity and fervent zeal of the clergy, but also to their desire to effect an amelioration of manners and to reorganise society upon a basis of greater justice and less inequality. If the Council of Macon (585) enforced the payment of a tithe of all produce to the ministers of the Church, under penalty of perpetual excommunication, yet it was the Church alone that cared for the poor in this age. The Council of Lyons (583) decreed that in every town a lazarette should be built, where the lepers were nourished and cared for at the expense of the Church. The Council of Châlons (644) forbade the selling of Christian slaves out of the kingdom, and the fathers added, "Religion demands that Christians should be freed entirely from the bonds of slavery." The Assembly of Orleans (511) had granted the right of sanctuary to churches; this right, an abuse in a time of peace, order, and justice, was valuable in an epoch in which the weak were at the mercy of the strong. The Church boldly undertook the protection of the afflicted. She called to her the widow, the orphan, the poor, and the outlaw, and it was because she had with her all the feeble that she was

so strong, for the feeble and the oppressed were in those days almost the whole population.

Monasteries.—Side by side with the churches, monasteries arose. St. Martin introduced into the west that ascetic life which St. Anthony had first practised in the third century in the east and in the desert of the Thebaid. He founded the monastery of Ligugem, eight kilometres from Poitiers, and later that of Marmoutiers, near Tours. About the same time the monastery of L'Ile Barbe was built below Lyons, and at the beginning of the fifth century that of St. Victor at Marseilles, the two last long remaining famous. Thenceforward, monasteries rapidly increased, and by the sixth century there were already some two hundred and thirty-eight houses. The monks lived without any universal rule ; some gave themselves up to an excess of piety, which was more curious than edifying. An example is supplied by the pillar-saint of Treves, who stood upright and barefooted, summer and winter, on the top of a pillar, from which the bishops of the district with great difficulty induced him to descend. About 530, however, St. Benedict of Nursia drew up for the monks of Mont Casino a rule which was soon adopted throughout Gaul. This rule was sane ; it forbade useless self-torture, and divided the time of the monks between prayer, bodily exercise, and spiritual labours ; it enjoined the cultivation of the earth, but also the reading and copying of manuscripts. "Every letter written is a wound inflicted on the devil," said an abbot. A tiny lamp of literature was thus kept burning within the monasteries, and it was thence that it later shone through society, when society had recovered enough security and leisure to be able to think once more.

"An abbey was not only a place of prayer and meditation, but was also an ever-open refuge against the attacks of barbarism in all its forms. This refuge of books and learning contained workshops of all kinds, and its branches formed a definite model on which to build. In it were found examples of industry and activity for the labourer, artisan, and landowner. It was the school which taught those of the conquerors whom an enlightened self-interest led to undertake on their lands great enterprises in the way of cultivation or colonisation, the second of which was the necessary outcome of the first." (Thierry.)

The Gallo-Romans: Transference of Influence from the Towns to the Rural Districts.—The barbarians had overthrown the central government of the empire, but not the internal organisation of the towns. A Frank arrived in each as count, to

represent the king, and to receive the imposts which the Gallo-Romans continued to pay, and to administer justice. The conquered race preserved, however, their *curias* and magistrates, the use of Roman law and those institutions which in a great number of towns survived throughout the Middle Ages. But the continual presence of a Frankish count, invested with all the powers of a king, greatly impaired municipal liberties which in all other respects were increased. The inhabitants of towns regained the right to bear arms, of which the Romans had deprived them. Gallo-Roman society contained three main classes, the free landed proprietors, the colonists attached to the soil who cultivated the land, and domestic or agricultural slaves. According to the penal code of the Franks, the life of a Gallo-Roman was valued only at half that of a barbarian. The free Gallo-Romans lived mainly in the cities, according to the habits of Greek and Roman society, the rich on their revenues, the poor on the scanty industry which still existed. The barbarians, on the other hand, disdained to live in towns, preferring to remain, as they had been while beyond the Rhine, in the open air under great trees and at the edge of the hunting ground. The richest Gallo-Roman landowners followed the example of the masters of the land; they left the *triclinium* and the crowns of flowers, the perfumed baths and soft couches of the East, the poet and parasite who entertained them at their feasts, the games of the circus and the discussions of the courts which occupied their leisure, to engage in long hunts, rowdy orgies, and rough freedom of the barbarians. An important revolution was thus accomplished. The superiority which in ancient times had belonged to the cities passed to the rural districts, where the aristocracy was established, and the Middle Ages, in place of that municipal life in which civilisation and liberty developed, saw the reign of castles and of the landed nobility, which everywhere displayed brilliant military qualities, but which also for centuries held the peasant bent to his plough, the artisan to his last, in misery, ignorance, and servitude.

The Barbarians: Condition of Lands and Persons: Wergild.—After the conquest, the Franks appropriated a large part of the land of Gaul. Their new possessions, free from all taxes and binding their owners only to the duty of military service in national wars, formed the freehold of the warrior, and were known as allodial estates. Kings and influential chiefs who had reserved for themselves considerable domains further paid for the services of their *fideles* or *leudes*, their immediate followers,

with lands which were at first granted for life, but which, after the Treaty of Andelot (587), were handed over in perpetuity in most instances. To this grant, the obligation of military service and the performance of certain duties towards the grantor were attached, in return for the protection assured to vassals towards and against all others. These lands, guaranteed to their holders but yet dependent on superior lords, formed the "benefices." "Tributary lands" were those which the Franks left to the former proprietors on condition of the payment of a rent in money or kind.

The community was divided into three main classes. 1. The *free men*, who were subdivided into two classes, the allodial proprietors who owed nothing to any individual, but who were obliged to make certain gifts to the king, and who were bound to serve the state in national wars; and the leudes, who held benefices and who were obliged to perform certain duties towards those whose land they held. The royal leudes, from the ranks of whom the king always selected the dukes and counts whom he employed to command armies and to govern provinces and towns, were those who had received their holding directly from the king. These royal leudes, living in constant intercourse with the king, secured from him considerable domains, and with those chiefs who had enough land to distribute some to their men, formed an aristocracy, the power and pretensions of which daily increased.

2. The *lites*, who may be identified with the Roman *colonus*: they could not be arbitrarily deprived of the land which they farmed, and for which they paid to a proprietor a fixed rent.

3. The *slaves*, who did not retain that personal liberty which was still recognised as belonging to the lites and coloni.

In the penal system of the barbarians, according to which compensation or *wergild* (forfeit) might be made for every crime from murder to theft, the life of a Gallo-Roman was always reckoned at half the value of the life of a Frank.

Some examples may be given of this curious social hierarchy, determined according to the price of blood, a species of estimate which, being applied to a society wholly given over to every brutal passion, became a rule.

	sols.
For the murder of a free barbarian, a companion or leude of the king, slain in his house by an armed band, among the Salians	1800

	sols.
A duke among the Bavarians, a bishop among the Alemanni	960
A bishop among the Ripuarians, a Roman, being a king's leude among the Salians	900
The relatives of a duke among the Bavarians	640
All royal leudes, a count, a priest born free, a free-born judge	600
A deacon among the Ripuarians	500
A deacon among the Alemanni and Salians	400
A free Salian or Ripuarian	200
A free barbarian of other tribes	160
A slave who was a good goldsmith	150
A Roman owning land, a German lite, a slave who was a silver-smith	100
A freedman	80
A barbarian slave	55
A slave who was a blacksmith	50
The slave of a church on the king's demesne, a Roman tributary	45
A swineherd	30
A slave among the Bavarians	20

Government: Character of the Frankish Monarchy: The King: Counts and Dukes: National Assemblies: Mayors of the Palace.—Kingship was at the same time elective and hereditary, for while the king was elected the choice fell always upon some member of the Merovingian family. The kings were often known as the "long-haired kings." To cut their hair was to depose them. "A Frankish king was deprived of his long locks as an emperor of his crown," says Chateaubriand: "the Germans, in their simplicity made the natural crown of a man the outward sign of authority." Beyond the Rhine, kings had only possessed a very limited authority. After the conquest, the Gallo-Romans, and more especially the bishops, tried to instil into these princes some ideas of order and administration. The land was divided into counties and the counties into centuries. In each of the old Gallo-Roman cities, a royal officer, the count, administered justice concurrently with the bishop, for whose hearing certain cases were reserved. Franks, Gallo-Romans, Burgundians, and Visigoths were judged by the count, but according to their special law and customs. The count received public revenues and assembled the levy of free

men whom he led to the army. Sometimes several cities were united under the control of a duke, who, in this case, had several counts under his orders. Thus the barbarian kings showed less respect for municipal independence than the emperors had done. They even tried to restore the imperial financial system which had collapsed with the empire, but this attempt, in common with all those made by various kings and their ministers to introduce a modicum of order into this society, greatly offended the nobles, and more especially those of Austrasia, who were less familiar with Roman customs.

The Franks, indeed, had brought from Germany an idea which was unknown in the empire, that of the sovereignty of the people. Upon important matters, the king was obliged in early times to assemble a general council to which all free men were summoned (champ de Mars). At these assemblies, in memory of the ancient comradeship in arms which had existed in Germany, the Franks offered to their kings their annual gifts. In each county and century, free men formed the court of the count or centenier, in which justice was administered. These habits of liberty and equality accorded ill with the despotic principles of the imperial régime, and all who desired its return, Chilperic, Brunhilde, Ebroin, perished miserably.

Military Aristocracy.—But the defeat of attempted absolutism only profited the nobles, who gradually established in the midst of the nation a powerful nobility, which became more formidable when it secured a leader in the mayor of the palace. The king, who lived surrounded by a numerous crowd of leudes, had always disturbance and tumult around him. To produce order out of this chaos, he early appointed a major domo, or mayor of the palace, chosen by the nobles and having jurisdiction over all disputes which arose in the royal residence. At first he had charge only of the police of the palace and the command of the leudes; by degrees he assumed functions which the king would not exert himself to perform, and thus the mayor of the palace, more especially in Austrasia, forced the Merovingians to resign themselves to the position of *rois fainéants*.

Barbarian Laws.—Each German tribe had its own law. The codes of the Visigoths and Burgundians were greatly influenced by Roman law, under which the clergy and the Gallo-Romans lived. The laws of the Alemanni, Bavarians, Ripuarians, and Salians are preserved, and are distinguished from Roman law by three main characteristics. They formed a penal code, being only concerned with criminals, a proof of the extremely violent

state of society. In the second place, they permitted the expiation of every injury by compensation, a money payment (wergild), the amount of which varied mainly according to the rank of the injured person. Finally they admitted proof of facts by the testimony of a certain number of relatives or friends of the defendant or complainant. The judge was, however, able to order trial by battle, the judicial duel, and ordeals of cold water, boiling water, or red-hot iron. In the first case, the accused was thrown bound hand and foot into a tub of water, and was held to be guilty if he floated, on the ground that water, consecrated according to the rites of religion, could not receive into it anything impure. In the second case, he plunged his hand to the bottom of a vessel full of boiling water to take out a ring which the judge had thrown into it. If, after the lapse of a specified time, he showed no sign of scalding, he was acquitted. This was the judgment of God. The ordeal of hot iron was similar; a bar of iron, heated red hot, had to be lifted and carried a certain distance; if three days later the man's hand was without wound or if the wound was of a certain character, the accused was innocent. Torture and execution were punishments reserved for slaves and serfs convicted of a crime; the free man was commonly obliged only to pay the wergild.

An example to the contrary may however be cited in the story of the result of a trial by battle recorded by Gregory of Tours. "In the twenty-ninth year of King Gontran, as that prince was hunting in the forest of the Vosges, he found the remains of a wild bull which had been killed. The ranger of the forest, asked who had dared to kill the beast in a royal forest, accused Chaudon, the king's chamberlain. Gontran had him bound and brought to Châlons where he was confronted with the accused, who denied his guilt. The king ordered a trial by battle, and as Chaudon was old, he put forward his nephew to fight in his place. The two enemies were matched in an enclosed field. The young man, vigorously attacking the ranger with his lance, pierced his foot and caused him to fall; he then fell on him to cut his throat with his dagger, but the ranger stabbed him in the stomach, and both lay dead together. At this sight, Chaudon fled in great haste to take sanctuary at the church of St. Marcel, but Gontran cried that he should be taken before he reached it, and having had him bound to a stake caused him to be stoned to death." Without mentioning the fact that the lives of three men were sacrificed for a wild bull by the most amiable of the Merovingians, there may be noted the right possessed by old

men and women of employing a substitute, and the fate which befell one whose champion was defeated.

Salic Law.—This famous law, the authenticity of which has, however, been disputed, is said to have been drawn up in Latin after the passage of the Rhine, but before the baptism of Clovis. It is prefaced by a passage written at a later date by some clerk of Frankish race, who clearly reveals the continued barbarism of this people in his writing, but also his sincere devotion to the Church. "Glory to Christ who loves the Franks, who guards their realm and fills their king with the light of His grace, who protects their army, who grants to them signs which prove the truth of our faith, who gives the joys of peace and happiness. May the Lord Jesus lead in the way of piety the hearts of those who govern, for this is the nation which, small in numbers, but brave and strong, freed itself from the yoke of the Romans, and which, after receiving the sanctification of baptism, sumptuously adorned with gold and precious stones the bodies of the holy martyrs whom the Romans had burned with fire, massacred, mutilated with the sword, or caused to be torn in pieces by wild beasts."

The most famous, and perhaps the most doubtful, provision of the Salic law laid down that a woman might not inherit salic or allodial land, for which a Frank owed military service. This prohibition was natural: at a later date the inheritance of the crown was assimilated with that of Salic land, and women were, in France, always excluded from the throne.

Disorganisation of Slavery.—Owing to the increasing progress of doctrines of morality, ancient slavery had already lost something of its severity, when the Church, preaching the dogma of human brotherhood and common redemption, struck a heavy blow against it. Enfranchisement increased, and the slave was less under the absolute power of his master. The invasion, which threw everything into confusion, also disorganised slavery, the more so since a condition so contrary to nature could be maintained only by severe legislation. The barbarian, a proud conqueror, drew no distinction between the toga and the tunic, between master and slave. In the general misery, the gap between them was reduced. Luxury disappeared and, as Germanic customs spread everywhere, domestic slaves became less numerous. Relegated to the rural districts, they approximated in condition to the coloni, and the majority became demesne serfs, adscript to the soil and owing definite labour in place of arbitrary service. This new class was recruited

from above and below. The slaves rose, the coloni and free men, having lost their all, descended. In the ninth and tenth centuries the revolution was complete; few slaves remained, there were only serfs, though eight centuries more passed before this latter type of slavery was extinguished.

Story of Count Leudaste.—The adventurous story of a man who born in a humble position rose to the highest rank supplies a clearer picture of this barbarous society by showing it in actual operation.

Leudaste was born a serf of the royal household. Caribert's agent employed him in the lowest service of the palace, and at the first opportunity he fled. Three times he was retaken, each time he escaped again. Flogging and confinement had no effect upon him; his ear was therefore cut off, and he was marked with a scar of indelible shame. Yet he saved himself. Caribert at this time married a servant of the palace, Markowefe, the daughter of a wool carder. Leudaste succeeded in interesting the new queen in the lot of her old companion in slavery. She gave him the care of her horses; thence he rose to the position of count of the queen's stables, which placed him not only among the ranks of free men but on a level with Frankish nobles. The ability with which he exploited the favour of Markowefe enabled him to accumulate enough wealth to buy, by his presents to King Caribert, the rank of count of the royal stables and later that of Count of Tours.

Leudaste then believed that he might do what he would; he was guilty of exactions, violence, and outrages. The death of Caribert freed the people from this scourge; Tours fell to the share of Sigebert, and Leudaste went to live in the palace of Chilperic, where he tried to secure over Fredegonde an ascendancy similar to that which he had possessed over Markowefe (567). Five years later, a native of Auvergne of noble birth was chosen Bishop of Tours by the clergy and people of that town, whose affection he had gained during a pilgrimage to the tomb of St. Martin. He was the grave and pious personage to whom we owe so many valuable details of this period, the historian of the Franks, St. Gregory of Tours. King Sigebert confirmed this happy choice. Gregory, thanks to his birth, his strong and serious character, and his office, soon secured a considerable influence, even beyond the walls of his episcopal town. When the troops of Chilperic entered the city in 574, Leudaste was restored to his office, but owing to the presence of Gregory, showed some restraint for a time. The murder of Sigebert,

however, freed him from all fear and gave him assurance; he began again those violences and cruelties which had marked his former tenure of office. When he sat as judge, he often abused the suitor and even the audience; he threw priests into chains and struck Frankish warriors with his staff. At such times the former serf made no distinction between conquerors and conquered. As for right, that obviously consisted as far as he was concerned in ability to bribe him.

Gregory bore his violent conduct in patience for two years. Then a deputation sent secretly from Tours revealed everything to King Chilperic; Leudaste after an inquiry was deprived of his office. Forthwith he vowed eternal hatred against the bishop who had driven him out and Fredegonde who had failed to support him. He formed a plan for the destruction of both; he arranged with a priest Rikulf, who aimed at Gregory's position, and with a sub-deacon of the same name who had some different aim in view, to go to Chilperic and to accuse the bishop of designing to hand over Tours to the King of Austrasia and spreading defamatory reports about Fredegonde. The king's anger at this double revelation was extreme, and he demanded that Leudaste should produce his evidence. The ex-count named two friends of Gregory, who, he said, would speak if put to the torture, and the sub-deacon Rikulf who would speak voluntarily.

Leudaste hoped that Chilperic would exhibit in this matter all the violence of his barbaric passions and that, content with his evidence and that of Rikulf, he would, without any further information, expel Fredegonde and disgrace the bishop. But between Fredegonde and Chilperic there were ties of affection and of crimes which were not easy to break. Informed of the charge brought against her, she had enough influence over Chilperic to secure that the matter should be fully examined calmly and deliberately. She felt that she had an enemy and was determined to find him. A synod of all the bishops of Neustria was assembled in the royal manor of Braine to judge Gregory.

When the synod opened, the whole Gallo-Roman population of the district hastened to bear witness to its sympathy for the bishop, and the Franks themselves saluted him with respect. Berthram, Bishop of Bordeaux, explained the facts of the case, and asked Gregory whether it was true that he had made imputations against the queen's honour. "In truth I have said nothing of the kind," answered the Bishop of Tours.

The slight murmur of satisfaction which these words caused

in the court became stamping and shouting outside. Despite the king's presence, the Frank vassals, strangers to the Roman idea of royal majesty and of the sanctity of judicial proceedings, suddenly intervened in the discussion with remarks characterised by a rough freedom of language. "Why are such charges brought against a priest of God?—How is it that the king pays attention to such a matter?—Is a bishop to be held capable of saying such things on the mere report of a slave?—Lord God, bring help to thy servant." At these cries of opposition, the king rose, but without anger, being well acquainted with the brutal licence of his leudes. Raising his voice that the crowd outside might hear his apology, he said to the assembly, "The charge made against my wife is an outrage on me, and I am bound to resent it. If you think it well that witnesses to the charge against the bishop should be produced, they are here present, but if it seems to you that it should not be done, and that the good faith of the bishop may be trusted, say so; I will gladly do what you ordain."

The bishops, delighted and a little astonished by such moderation and docility in King Chilperic, at once allowed him to call the witnesses to the charge, whose presence he had announced; only one, the Sub-Deacon Rikulf, appeared. The two friends of Gregory whom Leudaste had named persisted in declaring that they knew nothing. As for Leudaste, taking advantage of his liberty and of the disorder which had marked the institution of these proceedings, he had not only not come to the hearing, but had further taken the precaution of going far away from the scene of these debates. Rikulf, bold to the end, was ready to speak, but the members of the synod checked him, crying on all sides, "A clerk of inferior rank cannot be believed in a matter of justice against a bishop."

As proof by witness was thus destroyed, there was nothing left but to rely upon the word and oath of the bishop. The king, true to his promise, raised no objection to this method of procedure, but he was guilty of deceit as to the form in which the oath should be taken. Whether from mere caprice, or from some vague memory of old Germanic superstition which survived under Christian forms, he decided that the justification of Bishop Gregory should be accompanied by strange acts which might be regarded as supplying some sort of magical proof. He demanded that the bishop should say mass three times in succession at different altars, and that at the end of each mass, on the

steps of the altar, should swear that he had never said the words attributed to him.

The three masses were said and the three oaths taken at the three altars. Soon afterwards the council reassembled. Chilperic had already taken his place, but the president of the assembly remained standing, and said with majestic gravity, "King, the bishop has done all that was prescribed: his innocence is proved: what have we to do? It remains for us to deprive of Christian communion you and Berthram, the accuser of one of his brothers." Struck by this unexpected sentence, the king changed colour, and with the confused air of a schoolboy who would cast the blame for a fault upon his accomplices, answered, "But I have not mentioned one thing which I must say." "Who first mentioned the charge to you?" asked the president, with an air of the most absolute authority. "It was from Leudaste that I have learned all," said the king, trembling lest his ears should hear the terrible sentence of excommunication.

An order was at once given that Leudaste should be brought to the bar of the assembly, but he was found neither in the palace nor in the neighbourhood; he had wisely escaped. The bishops resolved to proceed against him for contumacy, and to declare him excommunicate. When the deliberation was closed, the president of the council arose and pronounced the anathema, according to the consecrated forms:—"By the judgment of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, in virtue of the power granted to the apostles and to their successors of binding and loosing in Heaven and on earth, we all together do decree that Leudaste, the sower of scandal, the accuser of the queen, the false accuser of a bishop, having withdrawn from the hearing of this case that he might evade judgment, shall henceforth be separated from the bosom of Holy Mother Church, and excluded from all Christian communion. In the present life and in the life to come no Christian shall greet him or kiss him, no priest shall celebrate mass for him or administer to him the Holy Communion of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ; no one shall associate with him or receive him into his house, or deal with him on any matter, or drink or eat with him, or speak with him, save it be to urge him to repentance. Let him be cursed in the name of God the Father who created man; let him be cursed in the name of God the Son who suffered for man; let him be cursed in the name of God the Holy Ghost who comes to us in baptism. Let him be cursed in the name of all the saints

who since the foundation of the world have found grace with God. Let him be cursed wheresoever he may be found, in his house or in the fields, on the road or in his secret chamber; let him be cursed in living and dying, in waking and sleeping, in working and resting. Let him be cursed in all the powers and organs of his body; let him be cursed in all parts of his members, so that from the crown of his head to the soles of his feet there may not be the least whole part in him; let him be delivered to damnation with Dathan and Abiram, with those who said to the Lord, 'Depart from us'; as the fire is extinguished by water, so let his light be put out for evermore, if he does not repent and come to make satisfaction." At these last words, all the members of the assembly who had listened so far in complete silence, together raised their voices and cried many times, "Amen, so let it be; let him be anathema. Amen, amen."

Judgment was then passed on Rikulf who was condemned to death. At the prayer of Gregory, Chilperic spared his life, but before allowing him to pass out of her power, Fredegonde caused him to be cruelly tortured. "I do not believe," says the Bishop of Tours, "that any inanimate object, any metal, could have resisted all the blows with which this unhappy being was afflicted." From the third hour to the ninth he remained hanging from a tree with his hands bound behind his back; at the ninth, he was taken down and stretched on a wooden horse, where he was flogged with sticks, whips, and doubled straps, and that not by one or two men, but by as many as could reach his wretched body, all took part in this work and struck him.

In the midst of these tortures, Rikulf confessed the whole plot. They had hoped to banish the queen and her two sons, so that Clovis, Chilperic's eldest son, might inherit the throne; Leudaste would then have become a duke, the first man in the state after the king. Fredegonde never forgot the destiny which Leudaste had intended for her husband's son.

Leudaste, however, fled in disguise. He reached Tours before the sentence passed on him was known, collected all his riches, and retired into Berry, which belonged to Gontran. But at the first village through which he passed, the sight of his burdened waggons excited the greed of the inhabitants. The judge of the district put himself at the head of the people, and all the treasure was taken. Some time afterwards he himself fell into the hands of the soldiers who were searching for him, and his only resource was to take sanctuary at St. Hilary of Poitiers. After the delight of finding himself in safety, he wearied of his refuge in this holy

place. There were there many outlaws, and these he organised into bands which from time to time ranged into the town, robbed one or two houses, and then returned to enjoy in the church the fruits of their rapine. Scandalous orgies, games, blasphemies, and quarrels occurred there, and at last he was expelled as unworthy of the protection of the saint.

For two years he vanished from view, until the friends whom he had at the court of Neustria obtained leave from the king and bishops for him to return to his house at Tours. But Leudaste was not a man to profit from experience. His return of good fortune did not seem to him to be complete, and he went to the court of Neustria to recover the favour of the king. For some while Chilperic avoided him ; at last, giving way to his insistence, he consented to see him, but advised him to act cautiously where the queen was concerned. The advice was good ; Leudaste took no notice of it. One Sunday, when the king and queen were together at mass in the cathedral at Paris, Leudaste went to the church, passed with a bold air through the crowd which surrounded the royal seat, and prostrating himself before Fredegonde, who was far from expecting to see him, begged her to pardon him.

At this sudden apparition of a man whom she hated mortally, and who appeared to have come less to implore pardon than to brave her anger, the queen was seized by a most violent access of spite. The colour mounted to her face, tears rolled from her eyes, and throwing a glance of bitter disdain at her husband, who sat unmoved beside her, she cried, " Since I have no son to whom I can commit the duty of avenging my wrongs, I entrust that duty to thee, Lord Jesus." Then to make a last appeal to the conscience of him who ought to have protected her, she threw herself at the king's feet, saying with an expression of lively grief and wounded dignity, " Woe is me that I see my enemy, and can do nothing against him."

The king ordered that Leudaste should be expelled from the church. Instead of flying in all haste, he told himself that the queen's anger might be appeased by presents, and waited in the shops which were near the church to select stuffs and jewels for her. He was still there when the queen came out of the church. She saw him, and scarcely entering the palace, sent some men to secure his person for her. He wounded one, and though himself severely wounded by a sword cut on the head, escaped. But as he was crossing the bridge of the city, his foot slipped, he broke his leg, and was seized. The king and queen long debated

in order to find a method of execution which should satisfy them. Weakened by the loss of blood which he had suffered, he could not bear prolonged torture. They called in able doctors, in order that he might be made well enough to suffer, but his wounds mortified. When Fredegonde knew this, she caused him to be dragged from his bed, stretched on the pavement, the nape of his neck resting against a great bar of iron; then a man armed with another bar struck at his throat until he gave up the ghost.

In this story it appears that, despite difference of race, a Roman, even a serf, could, thanks to the general disorganisation, take rank among the Frankish nobles; that the bishops had an important position in civil society; that the Church sometimes paid dearly for the sanctuary which she offered to all outlaws by the scandals which they caused; and especially there appears the implacable hatred of Fredegonde. We cannot draw an equally clear picture of Chilperic, reading his halting verses to Gregory of Tours, or discussing with him the doctrines of the Trinity; trying to introduce new letters into the Roman alphabet, to render the gutteral accent of German; trembling before his wife and his soldiers, who pillaged friend and foe alike wherever they went.

CHAPTER X

CLOTAIRE II. AND DAGOBERT, SOLE KINGS OF THE FRANKS: ANARCHY AFTER THEIR TIME (613–687)

Clotaire II., Sole King (613–628).—As a result of the death of Brunhilde and of the children of Thierry II., the son of Fredegonde at last became sole king. The heritage of Clovis was once more ostensibly united, but the mayors of the palace of Burgundy and Austrasia compelled the king to swear that he would not deprive them of their offices, and that he would not interfere with the election of their successors, which was to be exclusively in the hands of the *leudes*.

Perpetual Constitution of 615.—In 615, however, a vigorous attempt was made to organise the Frankish monarchy. Seventy-nine bishops assembled at Paris with the *leudes* of the three realms, and the king confirmed by an edict, or perpetual constitution, the decisions of this body. The election of bishops was reserved to the clergy and people of the dioceses, the king

only having the right of confirming the election, after which the metropolitan should consecrate the elect. Clerks were to be judged only by their bishops. The direct taxes, introduced by Chilperic, Fredegonde, and Brunhilde, were abolished, but tolls levied on roads and at the entrances of towns were retained. The judges of counties were to be elected always from the landed proprietors of the district, a measure favourable to the aristocracy, since by it the greater landowners were invested with judicial power, which at that time included all others.

The provisions of this constitution were very largely directed against monarchical authority for the benefit of the dual ecclesiastical and military aristocracy which was arising. "The king," it was declared, "shall not establish any new tax. He shall not enter upon the inheritance of those who die intestate, but shall allow it to pass to the lawful heirs. He shall not in future permit the removal from monasteries of wealthy widows and religious women by those who wish to appropriate their property by forcing them into marriage. He shall restore to the *leudes* all that they may have lost in the recent troubles. He shall not receive appeals from ecclesiastical courts, but shall preserve their entire independence."

Obscurity of the Reign of Clotaire II.—The contemporary chroniclers knew nothing of the reign of Clotaire II., though they describe him as "gentle and kindly to all men, learned in letters, fearing God, a munificent patron of churches, the benefactor of the priests and of the poor; only giving himself with too much ardour to hunting and to seeking pleasure, for which cause he was blamed by his nobles." But it must not be supposed that the days of barbarism had passed. "The Saxons having rebelled," says another chronicler, "he so utterly subdued them by arms that he caused all the males of that race who were taller than the length of his sword to be put to death. He desired that the lasting memory of this fatal sword should destroy the daring of their children." This supplied an example of conduct sufficiently vigorous, but there is reason to believe that the sword of Clotaire II. was not always so terrible.

Dagobert, King of Austrasia (622).—In 622, Clotaire made his son, Dagobert, King of the Austrasians, under the regency of the mayor of the palace, Pippin of Landen, or Pippin the Old, and of St. Arnulf, Bishop of Metz. These two men, the ancestors of the Carolingian house, were related by the marriage of their children; Anseghis, son of Arnulf, married a daughter of Pippin of Landen, and from this union was born Pippin d'Heristal.

Dagobert, who succeeded his father in 628, was the mightiest of the Merovingian kings, and has remained the most popular figure among the rulers of that dynasty. "He was a prince," says his biographer, "terrible towards rebels and traitors, wielding the sceptre firmly, and rising like a lion in his wrath against the disturbers of the peace." Under him the Gascons, or Basques, who lived south of the Garonne, were defeated and promised obedience, though in actual fact that obedience proved to be somewhat illusory. Judicaël, Duke of the Bretons, came to the royal manor of Clichy to make submission. Beyond the Rhine, the majority of the Frisians and Saxons paid tribute; the Thuringians, Alemanni, and Bavarians humbly accepted the government of Dagobert. The Frankish dominion extended from the Weser to the Pyrenees, and from the Atlantic to the frontiers of Bohemia. Dagobert appeared as the foremost of all the barbarian rulers established within the limits of the old western empire. He was allied with the emperors of Constantinople; he intervened in the affairs of the Visigoths of Spain, to whom he gave a king; in those of the Lombards of Italy, whom he obliged to respect their queen, Gondeberga, his relative, and to attack the Wends, his foes. And it was within Frankish territory that the fugitive Bulgarians found a refuge.

In his internal government, Dagobert devoted himself to the administration of justice. He travelled through his dominions to repress disorder. "His advent," says Fredegar, "struck terror into the bishops and nobles, but filled the poor with joy." He reduced the laws of his barbarian subjects to writing and even recovered from the churches and monasteries many of the estates which they had usurped from the royal demesne. But he was liberal towards the clergy. He transferred to the church of St. Martin the impost due from the city of Tours, and to the monastery of Wissembourg part of lower Alsace, the inhabitants of which were to pay taxes to the abbot alone. At this time, public taxes were tending more and more to become private levies, and during the whole feudal period taxes in the strict sense were really unknown.

Dagobert founded the abbey of St. Denis, where the majority of the French kings after his time were buried; he encouraged such arts as still existed and displayed a luxury unknown to his barbarous predecessors. His mildness won him the epithet of the Frankish Solomon, and the name of the goldsmith, St. Eligius, his minister, is inseparably united with his own.

Signs of Approaching Decay.—The reign of Dagobert, which

was a period of rest between the epoch of conquest and that of decline, saw the beginnings of decay. The king was forced to hand over the larger part of Aquitaine to his brother Caribert. Ten thousand Bulgarian families took refuge in Bavaria, and he was unable to deliver himself from them except by ordering their massacre. The Wends, established in Bohemia and Moravia, pillaged Frankish merchants and refused reparation. Dagobert sent an Austrasian army against them; it was defeated, and the savages plundered Thuringia with impunity. During his life, and still more after his death, rebellions increased. The Saxons refused tribute, the Thuringians revolted, the Frisians created a duke for themselves, and the Bavarians and Alemanni only rendered a purely nominal obedience. Even in the interior of Gaul, Frankish dominion was pushed back upon the Loire. The descendants of Caribert ruled in the Garonne valley, where their posterity was represented by the dukes of Gascony and Aquitaine and by the counts of Armagnac. Southern Burgundy also created its own national chiefs, and in the districts which held to their allegiance the kings found themselves confronted by all-powerful officials who despoiled them of their authority.

The Mayors of the Palace.—The mayors of the palace have already been mentioned as judges of all the disputes which occurred in the royal palace. Gradually they became the leaders of the *leudes*, the aristocracy, and at the same time the chief ministers of the kings. In 613, when the nobles handed over Brunhilde to the son of Fredegonde, the mayors of the palace took care to provide for their own interests. "Warnachaire," says Fredegar, "was made mayor of the palace in Burgundy, and received an oath from the king that he should never be deprived. Radon, mayor of Austrasia, Gondelaud of Neustria, received the same promise." Not only did the mayorality of the palace become a life office, but in Austrasia it became also hereditary, with the result that the functions of monarchy fell into the power of the mayor, while the title of king remained to the representative of the Merovingian dynasty.

The Sons of Dagobert (638–656).—When Dagobert died (638), his two sons were still children. One, Sigebert II., reigned in Austrasia under the guardianship of Pippin of Landen as mayor; the other, Clovis II., reigned under the guardianship of Erkinoald in Neustria and of Flaochat in Burgundy. Sigebert died in 656, and Grimoald, son of Pippin and his successor as mayor of Austrasia, believed himself to be sufficiently assured of the support of the nobles to make his own son king. He caused

Dagobert, the rightful heir of Sigebert II., a boy of three years, to be carried across to Ireland and shut up in a monastery, and produced a forged will by which the late king adopted and appointed as heir to his kingdom the son of Grimoald. But the blood of the Merovingians still commanded respect; Clovis II. overthrew the usurper and reunited the whole monarchy (656), though he died in the same year.

Associated with his name is the legend of the "imbeciles of Jumièges." According to it, Clovis II., having defeated his two sons who had revolted against him, rendered them imbecile by causing their hamstrings to be burned. This punishment did not kill them. But from this time they were lunatics without vital force, and as they languished under their father's eyes, he was struck by remorse and shame. One day he ordered them to be placed in a boat on the Seine and left to the current to be carried where God would. The stream bore them as far as the peninsula upon which St. Philibert had founded the monastery of Jumièges. The monks received the imbeciles, and for long showed their tomb. They are a veritable symbol of the Merovingian race, prematurely exhausted in mind and in body, guarded and received by the Church.

Ebroïn, Mayor of the Palace (659–681): His Struggle against the Nobles and against Austrasia: St. Leger.—The eldest of the three sons of Clovis II. was four years old. The mayor, Erkinoald, left the monarchy undivided between them. The eldest, Clotaire III., seemed to reign under the tutelage of his mother, Queen Bathilda, an Anglo-Saxon slave whom pirates had sold on the Frankish coasts. Bathilda did not forget her origin, and during the ten years of her power she laboured to improve the lot of the slaves and the poor. But the nobles opposed this government of a woman whom they found always surrounded by bishops. In 664 they murdered her chief adviser, the Bishop of Paris, and Bathilda retired into the monastery of Chelles which she had built.

Erkinoald died in 659 and Ebroïn took his place. He was an ambitious and talented man, who proposed to revive the power of the monarchy, the authority of which was in his own hands, since there were then only children on the throne, Clotaire III., in Neustria and Burgundy, and since 660 Childeric II. in Austrasia. The *leudes* had their wish, kings without power; aristocracy and anarchy were triumphant. Ebroïn aimed at putting an end to the turbulence of the nobles. Some he exiled, some he condemned to forfeiture, many were put to death.

With a rare sense of government, he refused to confer the position of dukes and counts upon those who were possessed of considerable property in the districts which they desired to govern.

On the death of Clotaire III. in 670, in place of assembling at least the chief men of the monarchy for the purpose of proclaiming a new king, Ebroïn placed on the throne by his sole authority a third son of Clovis II., Thierry III. Thus the power of the mayor of the palace, which the nobles had so strengthened that it might aid them against monarchy, was now used against them, Ebroïn reviving the schemes of Brunhilde against the Frankish aristocracy. That aristocracy was not prepared to abandon the position which it had gained. In the three kingdoms, the *leudes* and bishops armed against Ebroïn, under the direction of St. Leger, Bishop of Autun. Surprised by a sudden attack, the mayor had time neither to defend himself nor to fly. He and his king were taken, tonsured, and confined as monks, Thierry at St. Denis, Ebroïn at Luxeuil; Childeric II. of Austrasia became sole king (670).

But civil war soon broke out again. St. Leger offended the Austrasian nobles, who attacked and deposed him, confining him in the same place which served as a prison for Ebroïn. The two enemies were reconciled for a moment. The death of Childeric II., murdered with his wife and son by a noble of Neustria whom he had caused to be flogged, opened the gates of Luxeuil for the prisoners (673).

Such general confusion reigned that men said the coming of Antichrist was drawing near. Ebroïn, as the abler of the two, was the first to reconstruct his position from this chaos. He renewed the conflict in the name of Clovis, an alleged son of Clotaire III., caused Leger to be blinded and afterwards executed, a fate which eventually gained for the bishop the honour of canonisation (678). He then abandoned his pretender and restored Thierry III.

Ebroïn had subdued the aristocracy in Neustria and Burgundy, but that of Austrasia was less easy to defeat. After the violent death of Dagobert II., assassinated in 679, the nobles of Austrasia abandoned kings who were either unable to protect them or were merely oppressive, and gave to their mayor, Martin, and to his cousin, Pippin d'Heristal, both of whom were grandsons of Pippin of Landen and Bishop Arnulf, the title of Duke of the Franks. Many Neustrian nobles fled to Austrasia, from which state an army set out in 680 to attack Ebroïn. But it was

defeated at Leucofao in Laonnais, and Martin, beguiled to a conference, was treacherously killed by Ebroïn. The Neustrian mayor of the palace was himself assassinated in the following year, and with him fell the last defender of Merovingian royalty.

Battle of Testry (687) : Final Fall of the Kings of the First Dynasty and of the Neustrian Franks : Ascendancy of the Austrasian or Ripuarian Franks.—Berthaire, who attempted to carry on the work of Ebroïn, had neither his energy nor his talents. When Pippin demanded that he should reinstate the Neustrian nobles who had taken refuge in Austrasia, he answered that he would go and search for them in person and set out with a numerous army. But "Roman France," as Neustria was already coming to be called, was defeated at Testry (near Peronne) by Teutonic France. This battle really ended the first dynasty of Frankish kings. For if the Merovingian monarchs still bore the royal title until 752, it was without enjoying even the semblance of power. In the space of these sixty-five years there was not a single movement in favour of this degenerate race, which seemed to have difficulty even in living. Almost all its members died young : those who attained the age of thirty were old men ; it was a matter of surprise that they reached that great age.

FOURTH PERIOD—CAROLINGIAN FRANCE

(687–887)

CHAPTER XI

RECONSTRUCTION OF THE EMPIRE AND OF THE CENTRAL POWER BY THE AUSTRASIAN MAYORS OF THE PALACE (687–752)

Origin of the Carolingians. — The Merovingian monarchy, which attained its zenith under Dagobert, fell after his death into the incapable hands of the *rois fainéants*, and was gradually dissolved. But among the Ripuarian Franks, who on the banks of the Rhine had preserved the warlike energy of the first conquerors, a family arose which possessed all the qualities necessary to enable it to exercise a great influence. Its property was considerable, since it held some one hundred and twenty-three domains, and it thus controlled a large clientèle, that is to say, many warriors were attached to its fortunes. If all the members of the family attracted attention by their wealth and courage, some were also distinguished for their saintliness. Three of them, Arnulf, Rudolf, and Drogo, successively held the episcopal see of Metz. Pippin of Landen was mayor of Austrasia under Clotaire II. "In all his judgments," says his biographer, "Pippin attempted to conform his decisions to the principles of divine justice, and in all matters availed himself of the advice of the blessed Arnulf, Bishop of Metz, whom he knew to be filled with the fear and love of God. If it happened that Pippin, owing to his illiteracy, was not in a position to decide a case, Arnulf, a faithful exponent of the divine will, supplied him with a just opinion on the matter, since he was able to interpret the Holy Scriptures, and before becoming a bishop had fulfilled without reproach the functions of mayor of the palace. Strong in the support of such a man, Pippin imposed the curb of equity upon the king himself, and prevented any abuse of royal power. After the death of Arnulf, he made use of the help of the blessed Cunibert, Bishop of Cologne, and his passion for justice may be gauged from the fact that he submitted his conduct to the supervision of such watchful and incorruptible arbiters. He passed his life in the earnest practice of just and honest dealing,

and by the counsel of these pious men he remained constant in the exercise of good works." Itta, the wife of Pippin of Landen, and his daughter, Gertrude, "the chosen bride of the king of angels," as an old chronicler calls her, died in the odour of sanctity, and Pippin himself was canonised, as Arnulf had already been. His grandson was St. Wandrille.

It is not surprising that a family so holy and so powerful secured an ascendancy over all the nobles of Austrasia. Its head possessed the mayoralty of that kingdom as if by hereditary right during the seventh century; Pippin of Landen and Arnulf were succeeded by Grimoald, who believed himself to be powerful enough to place his own son on the throne. Pippin d'Heristal, the grandson of Arnulf by his father Anseghis, and of the elder Pippin by his mother Begga, succeeded Grimoald.

Under the guidance of this family, which took its name from Charlemagne, the most illustrious of its sons, the nation after a century and a half of civil wars began to resume its former career of conquest. The dominion of the Franks had crumbled away in every direction; they restored it. Royal authority had become merely nominal; they revived its strength. In a few years they built up a new empire as wide as had been the old Roman Empire in the West.

The period of two hundred years, over which the history of this family extends, falls naturally into three divisions. In the first period, the efforts of the earlier Carolingians were directed to bring again under Frankish rule those peoples who had established their independence, and to bring those nobles who imagined that no duty of obedience was laid upon them under the power of the crown (687–768). The second period is that of the conquests of Charlemagne and of his attempts to organise his dominions (768–814). The third period is that of his successors, under whom the disruption of the empire by the revolt of its subjects occurred, the renewed overthrow of royal authority by the usurpations of the great vassals, and finally the entire defeat of the work undertaken by the Carolingians (814–887).

Pippin d'Heristal (687–714).—After his victory over the Neustrians at Testry, Pippin, says a chronicler, took King Thierry III. and his treasures, and returned into Austrasia. These words sum up effectively the revolution which had occurred. Kingship was not formally destroyed, but the Duke of the Franks only retained a monarch that he might display to the popular assembly at rare intervals a prince of the family of Clovis. These princes have been called the *rois fainéants;* they

deserve that their names should remain in an obscurity as great as that into which they themselves fell even during their lifetime.

Pippin's work was twofold. He had to reconstruct the Frankish empire which was dissolving into its constituent elements, and to restore the power of the crown which had been already ruined. Of these tasks, the second was the more difficult of accomplishment. The Austrasian aristocracy was ready enough to bring back under its yoke the peoples of southern Gaul and the Germanic tribes which had delivered themselves from Frankish domination, but they designed that this should result in their own advance and not in their decline. Yet, when they assisted their leader to destroy the liberty of others, they supplied him also with the temptation and the power to attack their own immunities. This was hardly the case under Pippin, but was seen clearly under Charlemagne.

While conciliating the nobles in every way, Pippin also revived the ancient institution of the *Champs de Mars*, by which means he gave himself an ally against the nobles in the body of free men, and he consulted this assembly every year on questions of peace and war.

The Neustrians did not attempt to recover from their defeat and Pippin endeavoured to attach them to his cause by marrying his son Drogo to the widow of their last mayor, Berthaire. Aquitaine was organised under national chiefs, but did not constitute a menace as the Germanic tribes became. It was against the latter that Pippin turned. "He made many wars," say the chronicles, "against Radbod, the pagan Duke of the Frisians, and against other princes, against the Suevi, and against many other nations; in these wars he was ever victorious."

Valuable allies aided him in this struggle; the missionaries who sought to evangelise the people Pippin tried to placate by bringing them within the limits of a great empire. St. Willibrod, appointed Bishop of the Frisians by the pope in 696, converted Radbod.

Death of Pippin d'Heristal (714) : Insurrection.—Pippin died in 714; his elder son, Drogo, had predeceased him, and his second son, Grimoald, had been assassinated at Liége as he was praying in a church. Grimoald had a son, a minor, Theobald, and him Pippin appointed as mayor of Neustria and Austrasia under the guardianship of his grandmother, Plectruda. But those who had been with difficulty held in check by the strong

arm of Pippin, refused to obey a woman and a child. The Neustrians established a mayor of their own, Raginfred, and attacked Austrasia from the west, while the Frisians and Saxons fell upon it from the east. The Austrasians thus hard pressed abandoned Plectruda and the child who had been given them as their chief. They took from the prison into which Plectruda had thrown him Charles, the natural son of Pippin, better known by the nickname of Marteau or Martel, which his bravery and energy in battle gained for him.

Charles Martel (715–743).—Charles was twenty-five years old, a true barbarian, a rough soldier. "A herculean warrior," says an old chronicle, "he was a victorious prince, who passing beyond the limits by which his ancestors had been restrained, and adding notable victories to the triumphs of his fathers, gained successes with honour over chieftains and kings, peoples and barbarous tribes, so that from the Slavs to the Frisians, to Spain and the Saracens, none of those who rose against him escaped from his hand, which subdued them under his empire and reduced them under his power." The situation of Charles was at first critical. The Neustrians and Frisians entered Austrasia simultaneously and penetrated as far as Cologne. He retired into the impenetrable district of the Ardennes, kept watch from the summit of those wooded hills, and waited for a favourable moment. One day with only five hundred horsemen he surprised the Neustrian army near Amblef; the enemy were seized by such a panic that they fled in all directions. Some of the fugitives threw themselves into the church of Amblef; one had reached the threshold in his flight when an Austrasian, giving a final thrust with his sword, struck his foot which was still outside the door. A question arose as to whether the right of sanctuary had been violated. The Neustrians said that it had; the Austrasian answered that he had respected all that part of the man's body which was within the holy place, and struck only that part which was outside it. It was decided that his contention was just.

A more serious battle took place in the following year at Vincy near Cambrai, where the Neustrians suffered a bloody defeat (717). The Aquitainians having come to their aid, Charles defeated the combined armies in a second battle near Soissons (719). He allowed the Neustrians to retain the puppet king, Chilperic II., whom Raginfred had given them, but ruled in his name. Repeated expeditions forced the Alemanni, Bavarians, and Thuringians to recognise the old supremacy of

the Franks ; the Frisians were threatened, and six times Charles invaded the land of the Saxons.

Victory of Poitiers : the Franks save Christendom from the Mohammedan Invasion (732).—But the greatest glory of Charles Martel was that he delivered France from that tide of Mohammedan conquest before which Africa and Spain had fallen. Masters of the Iberian Peninsula (711) after a battle which raged for three days, the Arabs were not checked by the lofty barrier of the Pyrenees ; they entered Gaul through the province of Septimania, captured Narbonne, Carcassonne, and Nîmes, besieged Toulouse, and almost destroyed Bordeaux. They advanced still further, reaching Poitou on the west and Burgundy on the east ; Autun was sacked, and in 731 they burned the church of St. Hilary at Poitiers.

The Merovingian Eudes, who reigned at Toulouse as Duke of Aquitaine, was defeated on the banks of the Garonne and resolved to apply for help to the mighty Duke of the Franks, and the champions of the two great invasions, the German and the Saracen, met in the neighbourhood of Poitiers. The conflict was terrible, and in popular memory survived as the most appalling of mediaeval battles. It effected the salvation of Christendom. Three hundred thousand Saracens, according to the exaggerated estimate of the old chroniclers, fell by the sword. The survivors fled for safety to the walls of Narbonne, and of all their conquests in Frankish territory the invaders preserved only Septimania, the coast line from the Rhône to the Pyrenees. After this victory, the Duke of Aquitaine, a descendant of Caribert, took an oath of fealty to the mighty mayor of Austrasia.

Conquest of Burgundy and Provence (733–759).—The Burgundians had refused submission to the degenerate successors of Dagobert, and Charles next turned his arms against them. Lyons, Vienne, Valence, and Avignon received Frankish garrisons, and being thus master of the Rhône valley, he advanced three or four years later to attack beyond the river those whom he had conquered at Poitiers. He invaded Septimania, destroyed the fortifications of Nîmes, burned its arenas, on which traces of the fire which he kindled may still be seen, and destroyed the maritime towns of Maguelone and Agde. In 739 he completed the reduction of Provence by taking the two powerful cities of Arles and Marseilles. The conquest of Septimania was reserved for his son Pippin.

Papal Invitation to intervene in Italy.—To reward his vic-

torious soldiers, Charles distributed to them lands or benefices which he appropriated from the vast domains of the Church. The clergy hated him and cursed his memory, though just before his death the pope appealed to him to invade Italy and protect him against the Lombards.

Mayoralty of Pippin the Short (741–752).—Of the two sons of Charles Martel, one, Carloman, received Austrasia and the land beyond the Rhine, while the other, Pippin, received Neustria and Burgundy. After the death of Thierry IV. in 737 Charles Martel had left the throne vacant, and Carloman followed this example, since in the midst of his German vassals he had no need to hide his power under the name of a king. Pippin the Short, master of the western districts, wishing to win over the Neustrians by flattering their old attachment to the royal house of Meroveus, proclaimed Chilperic III.

Victories over the Bavarians, Alemanni, and Aquitainians.—The dukes of the Bavarians, Aquitainians, and Alemanni refused obedience to the new rulers of the Franks, but the two brothers acted in concert and triumphed. Odilon, Duke of the Bavarians, submitted: the Duke of the Alemanni was deposed, and Hunold, Duke of Aquitaine, retired into a monastery. Carloman followed his example, and shut himself up in the monastery of Monte Casino (747). He had two sons, but Pippin appropriated his brother's inheritance without troubling as to the rights of his nephews, and, master of the whole empire, determined to put an end to the anomalous state of affairs which had subsisted since the Battle of Testry. His house had now attained such glory that he did not fear to resume the attempt which had been so disastrous in the case of Grimoald a century before.

The Last Merovingians (752).—"The family of the Merovingians," says Einhard, "had long ceased to display any virtues, nor was there anything illustrious about its members except their possession of the title of king. The prince was content to have flowing locks and a long beard, to sit on a throne and to represent the monarchy. He gave audience to ambassadors, and made to them the answers which were suggested or rather dictated to him. With the exception of a pension for his support, hardly assured and regulated by the mayor of the palace according to his pleasure, the prince held only one manor bringing in a modest revenue and there he held his court consisting of a few domestics. If there was need for him to travel anywhere, he went as the peasants did, seated in a waggon drawn by oxen and driven by a cowherd. It was thus that the king came to the

general assembly of the nation, which met every year to transact the business of the realm."

Relations of the Carolingians with Rome: Conversions of the Frisians and Saxons.—It was not difficult to hide in the depth of some monastery a monarch who had thus become useless and whose very existence was almost forgotten. Pippin already had national approval of his design, but he wished also to secure the appearance of right. The Iconoclastic Controversy had produced a rupture between the papacy and the Byzantine empire; the pope, threatened in Rome by the Lombards, needed some external support to save his independence, and he could find such support only among the Franks. For a long time the papacy had been connected with the rulers of that people, for since the time of Gregory the Great the Roman Church had resumed with energy the task of converting the heathen. England had been conquered by its missionaries, Germany was next attacked. St. Columbanus and St. Gall brought Helvetia within the fold; others spread the gospel in the valley of the Danube; Willibrod carried it to Frisia, Winfried into Saxony. All these missionaries set out upon their perilous journey from the land of the Franks. There they prepared for the attack upon idolatry; there they found pious recruits to aid in the sacred fight; and there, in the event of a reverse, they sought a refuge. On their side, the kings and dukes saw clearly enough that the spiritual conquest of the Germanic lands would prepare the way for their political conquest. They accordingly encouraged and supported the missionaries; their chief, the Anglo-Saxon Winfried, became celebrated under the name of St. Boniface, and was one of the advisers of Carloman. The two princes, at the councils of Leptines (473) and of Soissons (475), showed a pious and enlightened zeal for the true interests of the Church, and for the reformation of morals and discipline.

Pippin was thus naturally led to seek from the pope who implored his aid the grant of the title of king to him who held the royal power. "In the year 751," says Einhard, "Burchard, Bishop of Wurtzburg, and Fuldrad, a chaplain priest, were sent to Rome to Pope Zachary to consult the pontiff as to the kings who were then in France, and who, while possessing the royal title, had no shadow of royal power. The pope answered that it was far better that he who held the power should hold the title also, and enjoined that Pippin should be made king."

Childeric III. sent into a Monastery (752).—"In this year (752), after receiving the sanction of the Roman pontiff, Pippin

was declared King of the Franks, was anointed for his high office with the mystic unction by the holy hand of Boniface, bishop and martyr of blessed memory, and raised on the shield according to the custom of the Franks in the town of Soissons. As for Childeric, who was falsely styled king, Pippin shut him up in a monastery," that of Sithieu or St. Bertin, near St. Omer, where he died three years later.

The end of the first dynasty of the Frankish kings excites no regret as it created no impression. Contemporaries only saw in the event the just punishment of the contempt which the Merovingians had too often displayed for the Church. " The man of God," says the biographer of St. Columbanus, " sought out Theudebert, King of Burgundy, reproached him with his pride, and urged him to enter the bosom of the Church to repent, lest after having lost his earthly kingdom he should lose eternal life also." The kings of the first dynasty preserved even in the midst of their degradation something of that fierce barbarism of mind which is never found in the princes of the second dynasty. When he had heard the words of the monk, Theudebert and all his companions began to laugh, saying that they had never yet heard of a Merovingian becoming a monk of his own accord. " He despises the honour of becoming a clerk ; he shall become one whether he will or no," cried the saint, and Pippin was employed to bring this prophecy to pass.

CHAPTER XII

THE WARS OF PIPPIN THE SHORT AND CHARLEMAGNE (752–814)

Expedition of Pippin the Short into Germany (755).—When St. Boniface revived for the benefit of the son of Charles Martel the Jewish ceremony of anointing with mystic oil, it was the intention of Pippin, by securing this obsolete consecration from the Church, to give to his recent kingship a species of religious inviolability. He was, however, uncertain that the revolution which he had effected did not appear as a usurpation to certain scrupulous advocates of Merovingian legitimacy, and he therefore hastened to justify his action by his services. His authority extended over a small part of that district which may be most conveniently described under its modern name of Germany. Against the Saxons he made only two expeditions ; they

promised a tribute of three hundred horses, and free access to their land for Christian missionaries. In this quarter, Pippin seems to have desired not to disturb by warlike operations the civilising work of the priests, and his whole attention and all his efforts were directed rather towards the south, towards Italy, Aquitaine, and southern Gaul.

Expeditions of Pippin into Italy (755–756) : The Donation of Pippin.—In 755, Pope Stephen II. came in person to France to beg the help of Pippin against the Lombards, and conferred upon the king and his successors the title of Patrician of the Romans, which carried with it a certain vague sovereignty over the eternal city. Pippin was consecrated a second time by the pontiff, he then forced the passage of the Alps, which the profoundly degenerate masters of Italy proved incapable of defending, and besieged the Lombard king in Pavia. Aistulf promised to restore the lands which he had taken from the Roman Church, but failed to do so. In the following year, Pippin again entered Italy, compelled the Lombards to resign Ravenna and the whole exarchate, which rightfully belonged to the Byzantines. As he had no desire to retain such distant possessions, nor to restore them to the schismatic Greeks, he granted them to St. Peter ; this " Donation " was the origin of the temporal power of the popes (756).

Conquest of Septimania (752–759).—The Italian war, of which the results were far-reaching, had presented neither dangers nor difficulties ; the war of Aquitaine presented both. The descendants of the Merovingian Caribert reigned at Toulouse, having been adopted by the Aquitainians as their native princes, and as a result a national and bitter war broke out between them and the Franks. It began on the side of Septimania (Bas Languedoc), where the Goths rose against the Arabs and called the Franks to their help. Nîmes, Agde, and Béziers opened their gates, but Narbonne resisted for seven years. On its capitulation in 759, the Frankish empire was for the first time extended to the eastern Pyrenees.

Conquest of Aquitaine (759–768).—The dominions of Pippin now encircled Aquitaine on the north and east, and Duke Waifer was summoned to give up certain fugitive Austrasian *leudes*, and to restore the goods which he had taken from the churches. On this occasion also Pippin appeared as the champion of the Church. On Waifer's refusal, Pippin at once crossed the Loire, and from that moment Aquitaine was every year the scene of extensive Frankish raids, being handed over to systematic

devastation. From the Loire to the Garonne houses were burned, trees cut down. Each year the ravages were extended; first Bordeaux and its district suffered, then Auvergne and Limousin, then Quercy. Waifer with a handful of brave men constantly retired before the invader; his towns fell one after the other; all his men were taken or slain; he still fought on. At last, for some unknown reason, he was murdered (768). The independence of Aquitaine died with him, but among the Gallo-Roman people the sentiment of liberty was so active, hatred for the Franks so deep-seated, that more than once in later years the district struggled to recover its independence.

Death of Pippin (768).—On his return from this expedition, in 768, Pippin died at Paris, "and," says Einhard, "his sons, Charles and Carloman, were raised to the throne by the assent of the Franks." Pippin was surnamed "the Short" on account of his slight stature, which did not at all impair his strength, if any credence may be given to a very dubious story which relates that at a single blow he cut off the head of a lion, of which every one else was in terror. In his reign, the general assemblies were held in May instead of in March; they met regularly every year, and bishops were summoned to them as well as nobles. In 757, Constantine Copronymus, Emperor of Constantinople, had sent to him the first organs ever seen in France, and they were placed in the church of St. Cornelius at Compiègne.

Charlemagne and Carloman (768–771).—The empire only remained divided for three years, which were occupied with the completion of the work of Pippin in Aquitaine. On hearing of his son's death, Hunold left his monastery and again took up arms. Defeated, he was given up by the Gascons, but made his escape and carried to the Lombard court his spirit and his hatred for the Franks. In order to hold the turbulent population of Aquitaine in check, Pippin had already built the castle of Turenne; Charlemagne constructed that of Fronsac on the Dordogne, and in Bordeaux, the capital of the district, he set up at the gate of Ste. Croix, as a sign of his triumph and as a perpetual threat to that great city, a statue to his father.

Carloman had rendered inadequate help to his brother in this war, and the misunderstanding which thus arose was threatening civil strife when the younger prince died. He left sons, but the Austrasians, having to choose between them and a man who had already shown himself to be the worthy successor of Pippin, did not hesitate to select the latter, nor had the uncle any

scruples in despoiling his nephews. The rules of succession were not then defined as they are now, but this incident shows that the ancient right of the Germanic peoples to elect their own chief was regarded as superior to that of sons to inherit from their father.

Charlemagne, Sole King (771).—Charles won the title of " the Great " (magnus) by his victories, and this epithet has been inseparably united with his name by posterity. His long reign of forty-four years falls into two divisions, in the first of which he conquered, in the second of which he organised. By his victories, he extended the frontiers of the new Frankish empire to the Elbe, the Theiss, and the Bosna on the east; to the Garigliano in Italy and the Ebro in Spain on the south, thus doubling the area of the kingdom which he had inherited from Pippin. He was no crowned sage, no pacific prince assuming arms only in self-defence ; he was an uncultured barbarian. No attack threatened him ; the Arabs were divided, the Avars weakened, the Saxons unable to carry on a serious war beyond the limits of their forests and marshes. If Charlemagne led his armies beyond the original boundaries of his kingdom, it was because, in common with so many other rulers, he aspired to dominate more peoples and to leave a name which should re-echo through the centuries.

Conquest of Half Italy (773–774).—The sons of Carloman had taken refuge with Didier, King of the Lombards, who had already afforded an asylum to Hunold, the implacable enemy of the Franks. Charlemagne had recently insulted the king by sending back to him his daughter, after having been married to her for a year. Didier, moved by his resentment and by the councils of Hunold, urged the people to anoint the sons of Carloman as kings. Adrian informed Charlemagne who decided on an expedition across the Alps. The passes were no better defended than they had been in the time of Pippin, and only the towns of Pavia and Verona offered any opposition. Charles, leaving an army before these two places, went to Rome to receive the title of " Patrician," an oath of fealty from the Romans, and to confirm to the pope the Donation of Pippin. At Pavia, Hunold was stoned to death by the people, whom he endeavoured to induce to continue the defence ; Didier and his children were confined in a monastery, and Charles took the title of King of the Lombards (774). This event began the misfortunes of Italy, the independence of which was from this time almost entirely extinguished, since the successors of Charlemagne, as Holy Roman

emperors, claimed to rule in the valley of the Po. The Lombards retained their possessions in the south of the peninsula, the Frankish frontier being fixed at the Garigliano, and if the dukes of Beneventum accepted the overlordship of Charles, the tribute due from them was in general only paid when an army came to demand it.

War of Saxony (772–804).—The war of Saxony was far more difficult and dangerous than that of Italy, since the Saxons, a brave and spirited people, heroically defended their liberty. It is unfortunate that for this struggle we have only the bald and prejudiced narrative of Einhard. Conquered nations very rarely relate their misfortunes, and as a result posterity, deceived by the accounts given by the conquerors, too often cries with the Gallic *brenn, Vae victis !*

Religion supplied the pretext for the war. The Saxons burned the church of Deventer and threatened with death the missionaries who were labouring in their midst. Charles at once entered their land, wasted it everywhere with fire and sword, took the castle of Ehresburg, and overthrew the idol, Herminsul, the memorial raised by patriotism to Arminius, the liberator of the Germans from Rome. In 774, while Charles was in Italy, the Saxons tried to burn the church of Fritzlar ; the king returned and began a war of extermination, the chief events in which were the victories of Bucholz, Detmold, and Osnabruck ; the massacre of 4500 Saxons, who were beheaded at Verden; the forcible removal of part of the race to other provinces; and the compulsory conversion of the inhabitants. The hero of the resistance was Widikind, who fought until 785, when he submitted and was baptised at Attigny.

The Saxons take up Arms for the Last Time in 803.—As early as the year 787, Charles had issued, for the regulation of Saxony, a capitulary for the infraction of almost every provision of which the death penalty was assigned. Capital punishment was inflicted not only for such crimes as were usually involved in it, but also for mere breaches of ecclesiastical ordinances, such as failure to observe the Lenten fast, refusal of baptism, association with pagans, and adoption of the heathen custom of cremating the body of a dead man.

Charlemagne was able to carry on this system for forty years, and as a result his methods, despite their atrocity, were successful. Saxony after his reign was subdued but Christian ; divided into eight bishoprics, filled with new cities and abbeys which formed centres of civilisation, this district, which had hitherto

been barbarous and pagan, entered into communion with the rest of the empire.

War between the Elbe and the Oder (789).—Conquerors are doomed to an eternal extension of their conquests. Beyond the Saxons, beside the Elbe, Charlemagne found the Wiltzes, and to prevent their incursions into Saxony he made them tributaries (789). When this had been accomplished, he found himself involved in wars against their northern neighbours, and the Franks, having passed the Weser, crossed the Elbe, which formed the frontier of Saxony, and penetrated to the Oder, while they were also obliged to extend their dominion to the banks of the Eider in order to prevent the Danes from entering Germany. The district between the Elbe and the Oder, however, did not receive that organisation which was given to the rest of the empire.

This territory bordered upon Bohemia, in which the Elbe rises, and which is enclosed by a ring of mountains. The armies of Charles entered it, but failed to reduce its people to submission.

War against the Avars (787–796).—There was in Bavaria an ancient ducal house the members of which regarded themselves as the equals of the Carolingians, and the chief of which, Tassilo, son-in-law of Didier, formerly King of the Lombards, submitted with reluctance to Frankish rule. In 787 a vast plot was formed. Tassilo, with the help of the Avars who occupied Pannonia to the east of Bavaria, was to attack Austrasia, while the Byzantines, in alliance with the Duke of Beneventum, were to fall upon Italy. Informed by Pope Adrian of the danger, Charles forestalled it by able and energetic measures. Tassilo was surrounded by three armies and soon appeared before Charles as a suppliant. The assembly of the Franks condemned him to death ; he was confined in a monastery with his son, and his duchy, subdivided into counties, was administered by Frankish counts. The conspirators in Italy had no time to act. The Avars arrived too late. They attacked Friuli and Bavaria simultaneously (788), and being driven back into Pannonia were pursued by the Franks. The war lasted until 796, when the "ring," or camp, of the Avars was taken. The Franks found there so much treasure, the product of the pillage of the Byzantine empire, that they became, according to Einhard, as rich by comparison as before they had been poor. The struggle was entirely fatal to the Avars, for that people, which had hitherto been feared throughout the Danube valley, was so weakened that it was reduced, in order to avoid the attacks of the Slavs, to seek an asylum from Charlemagne in Bavaria. Part of their land formed

the East Mark and was organised in the same manner as Saxony, towns and bishoprics being founded in it. It became the later Austria.

War of Spain (778–812).—Charlemagne was at Paderborn, engaged in effecting the compulsory baptism of the Saxons, when a Saracen, who declined to recognise the Caliph of Cordova, arrived with offers to place the Franks in possession of the towns which he had held south of the Pyrenees. Charles accepted the invitation, and passed with a numerous army through Gascony, of which the duke, Lupus, was forced to take an oath of fealty to him. He took Pampeluna and Saragossa ; but his allies gave him little help, and he returned to France through the passes of the Pyrenees. As the army was defiling in a long and narrow line through the valley of Roncesvalles, the Gascons, in ambush in the woods, fell upon the rear guard, threw it into disorder, and killed many counts. It was here that Roland fell. He was the commandant of the Marches of Brittany, and history knows nothing of the popular legends associated with his name. He was, however, famous in the poems of the Middle Ages, which celebrated at length his heroic exploits and his enchanted horn, of which it was said :—

> " Bruient li mont, et li vauls resona;
> Bien quinze lieues li oïes en ala,"

and *Durandal*, his sword, which could cut through rock and granite. William the Conqueror, setting out for the conquest of England, caused the " chanson de Roland " to be sung at the head of his army, and the Basque peasant still shows amid the Pyrenees the *Breche de Roland*, a circle of stones.

The Franks made six other expeditions beyond the Pyrenees. They were led by Charles's son and resulted in the formation of the Spanish March, or county of Barcelona, and of the March of Gascony, which later became the kingdom of Navarre. On this side, however, the empire was only extended to the Ebro ; Huesca and Saragossa remained in the hands of the Arabs.

In order to free the coasts from the piratical attacks of the Saracens, a fleet was sent to Corsica, Sardinia, and the Balearic Isles, from which the infidels were expelled (779).

Charlemagne, Roman Emperor in the West (800).—By the year 800 all these wars were more or less finished. Charles found himself at that date master of the modern France, of a very large part of the modern Germany, of three-quarters of Italy, and of a part of Spain ; he had increased by more than one-third the

territory which his father had left him. His vast possessions no longer formed a kingdom ; they had become an empire. He felt that he had done enough to justify him in ascending the throne of the western emperors, and as his father had demanded a royal crown from the pope, so he demanded an imperial coronation from the pope.

In the middle of the year 800, Charles went to Italy to direct an expedition which his son Pippin was leading against the Lombards of Beneventum. " He reached Rome," says Einhard, " on November 24. The pope was accused of many things : the king began the examination of the charges. But as no one was able to undertake their proof, the pope mounted his throne in the presence of all the people in the basilica of St. Peter the Apostle, took the Gospels in his hand, called upon the name of the Holy Trinity, and by oath purged himself of the crimes with which he was charged. On the same day, the priest Zachary, whom Charles had sent to Jerusalem, arrived at Rome with two priests, who came to the king by order of the patriarch, bearing his blessing with the keys of the Holy Sepulchre and of Calvary and a standard. The king received them graciously, kept them some days with him, rewarded them with presents, and gave them an audience when they were about to depart. On the holy day of the Saviour's birth, while the king prayed before the altar of the blessed Apostle Peter, the pope placed the crown on his head, and the whole population of Rome cried aloud, ' To Charles Augustus, crowned of God, the great and pacific Emperor of the Romans, life and victory.' After *Laudes*, he was adored by the pontiff according to the custom of ancient princes, and giving up the title of patrician, he was called Emperor and Augustus."

This ceremony, which occurred in the church of St. Peter on Christmas Day, 800, was an important event. The title of emperor in the west was drawn by the pope from the ruins under which it had been buried by the barbarians, and exhibited to divided and hostile nations as a standard to which they might rally. A new right was given to those who might inherit this crown, the right of commanding the peoples of Italy, Germany, and France, who from that time found themselves united under the rule of the first Germanic emperor. When the accidents of succession and fortune had transferred this title to the German kings, France found herself powerful enough to reject the rule of a foreign Caesar, but Italy did not, and from this circumstance arose half the evils from which the peninsula was to suffer.

Another personage acquired on this day an important prerogative. By crowning Charlemagne, Pope Leo III. fulfilled a function similar to that fulfilled by St. Remigius when he consecrated Clovis. His successors converted this duty into a right and regarded themselves as the dispensers of crowns. During the whole Middle Ages, imperial coronation could be received only at Rome, and from the hands of the pope, and many wars resulted on account of this new right.

Results of the Wars of Charlemagne.—Of the conquests of Charlemagne some were durable, some ephemeral, some beneficial, some the reverse. All his efforts beyond the Pyrenees proved abortive. The county of Barcelona, which he had added to France, did not remain united to it, and the March of Gascony naturally looked south across the mountains. It would have been more profitable if he had reduced the Bretons in the sense of incorporating them fully in Frankish national life, instead of contenting himself with a formal submission. The conquest of the Lombard kingdom was of no profit either to the Franks or to Italy, though it benefited the pope, whose political position it improved and to whom it eventually assured independence. The land which benefited most from these long wars was that which suffered most from them, Germany. Before Charlemagne, Germany was still "Germania," a weltering chaos of pagan or Christian tribes, all alike barbarous, hostile to each other, without any bond of unity between them. There were Franks and Saxons, Thuringians and Bavarians. After Charlemagne there was a German people, and presently there was also a German kingdom. To have created a people is a glorious act; it is a glory which few conquerors have won, since they have excelled rather at destruction than at construction, but it is one which Charles the Great secured to the full.

Appearance of the Northmen.—Charlemagne, by advancing the limits of his empire to the Eider, believed that he had protected Germany from the Northmen, but that people, perhaps under the influence of refugees from Saxony, appeared in their ships and began to raid the long coast-line of the empire. If the monk of St. Gall may be believed, they penetrated to the Mediterranean even in the emperor's lifetime. "They entered," says the chronicler, "the harbour of a town where Charlemagne was and were driven away, but the emperor, rising from the table, stood for a long while at a window looking eastwards, his face bathed in tears. As no one dared question him, he said to the nobles round him, 'Do you know, my friends, why I weep so

much ? Truly I do not fear that I shall suffer from these wretched pirates, but it grieves me that while I yet live they have succeeded in reaching this shore, and I am tormented with bitter sorrow when I think of all the evil that I foresee will come through them upon my heirs and their people.' " The story is dramatic, but it is unfounded. It is, however, certain that during the reign of Charlemagne the Northmen appeared, since he is known to have taken measures of defence against them ; two squadrons were stationed, one at Boulogne and another near Ghent, while two more were based upon the Garonne and the Rhône.

CHAPTER XIII

GOVERNMENT OF CHARLEMAGNE

Extent of the Empire.—The frontiers of Charlemagne's empire were on the north and east the Atlantic, from the mouth of the Elbe to the Spanish coast of the Bay of Biscay, with the exception of the Armorican peninsula, which was only tributary : on the south, the Pyrenees and the lower course of the Ebro in Spain : the Garigliano and Pescaro in Italy, with the exception of Gaëta and Venice, which owed a nominal allegiance to the Byzantine empire : and in Illyria, the Cettina or Narenta, with the exception of the maritime towns of Trau, Zara, and Spalatro, which were held by the Greeks. In the east, the frontier was formed by the Bosna and Save in Illyria, in Germany by the Theiss, from which the frontier bent westwards across Moravia as far as the mountains of Bohemia which it left to the east. Then it went northwards to the Saal and the Elbe. The district situated north of the mouth of the Elbe, as far as the Eider, recognised the direct rule of Charlemagne.

Beyond these boundaries there were peoples half subdued, half independent. The people of Navarre in the Pyrenees, the Duke of Beneventum in Italy, payed tribute when it was demanded at the point of the sword. Brittany and Bohemia had been ravaged but not conquered. Between the Elbe and the Oder, the Obotrites were allies rather than subjects, and it was found necessary to preserve their friendship by affording them a burdensome protection. As for the Wiltzes, so often defeated, they never laid down their arms. To these continental districts there may be added the Balearic Isles, Corsica, and perhaps also

Sardinia, doubtful possessions, which were disputed between the Franks, the Byzantines, and the Saracens.

Administration : The Count and the Centenier.—The empire was divided into counties and their areas reproduced with practical exactness the former limits of the Roman municipal divisions. The counts, who were the constant and resident representatives of the central government, combined civil, military, and judicial functions. On their appointment to their office, the king said, "Having proved your loyalty and services, we give you the authority of a count in this district. Preserve the faith which you have sworn, and take care that all the people who inhabit this district are treated with moderation. Rule them justly according to their laws and customs. Defend the widows and orphans. Repress with severity thieves and malefactors, that the people, living in prosperity under your rule, may rest in joy and peace. Take care that all the receipts due from our demesnes are annually paid into our treasury."

At a later date the viscount appears as a subordinate to the count. Under the earlier Carolingians, there existed the *centenier*, also styled the *viguier* or *vicar*, who had jurisdiction over a district which was originally that inhabited by a hundred families. The vicar held courts three times a year; he was assisted by the *scabini*, royal judges, appointed by the count, and by the free men of his district. He tried all cases other than those involving a death penalty, forfeiture, or loss of personal liberty; these were heard only at the tribunal of the count.

The Missi Dominici.—The *missi dominici*, usually a count and a bishop, were royal officials who went out four times a year to supervise the counts placed under their direction. It was their function to keep the emperor informed of the condition of public affairs. They heard the complaints of his subjects, reformed abuses, and received appeals from the judgments of the counts. "If a count does not do justice to those under his jurisdiction, then our *missi* shall reside in his house and live at his expense until right has been done," says a law of Charlemagne (779).

General Assemblies.—"It was the custom of this period," says Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims, "to hold two assemblies every year, in the spring and in the autumn. At both there were submitted to the great men the provisions of such laws, or *capitula* as they were called, which the king had drawn up under the inspiration of God, or for which the necessity had been made known to him in the interval between the two assemblies.

When the assemblies had received the royal suggestions, they debated them for one, two, three days, or more, according to the importance of the matter. Representatives of the king received their questions and made known the answers to them. No stranger might approach the place of assembly until the result of the discussions had been told to the sovereign, who then, in virtue of the wisdom with which he was endowed by God, adopted a decision which was accepted by all. These decisions were then embodied in one, two, or more capitularies, so that, with God's help, provision was made for all the needs of the time.

"While matters were being treated in this way outside the royal presence, the king himself, in the midst of the crowd which came to the general assembly, was occupied with the receipt of presents, with greeting the more important persons there, whether ecclesiastical or lay, talking with such as he rarely saw, displaying an affectionate interest in the older men, and jesting with the younger. If those who were deliberating upon public affairs expressed the desire, the king appeared among them. They then explained to him with perfect freedom their opinion on every matter, and all things were amicably discussed between them."

"If the weather were fine, all business was transacted in the open air; if not, in many different buildings. Those whose duty it was to debate upon the suggestions of the king were separated from the multitude of those who had come to the assembly, and the less important persons were not allowed to mingle with them."

"The places appointed for these assemblies of great men were divided into two parts, so that the bishops, abbots, and clergy were able to meet without coming into contact with the laity. In the same way the counts and other greater men of the state were separated at morning from the remainder of the multitude. The lords thus set apart met in the hall appointed for them, the clergy in one place, the laity in another, seats being honourably prepared for them. They might sit together or separately, according to the nature of the business which they had to transact, as to whether it was ecclesiastical, secular, or concerned both church and state. It was provided that they might, if they would, summon any one either to give his aid or to answer questions, and dismiss him after having received the required help."

"The king further inquired from each as to the state of that

part of the realm which was under his control. For all were strictly commanded to discover during the interval between two assemblies everything that occurred within and without the kingdom, and it was their duty to inquire into the affairs of aliens as well as into those of subjects, into those of enemies as well as into those of friends. The king wished to know whether in any part of the realm the people murmured or were disturbed, and if so what was the cause of the disturbance, whether there was any disorder with which the assembly should deal, and other similar details. He also strove to discover whether any of the tribes under his rule wished to revolt, whether any of those in rebellion seemed inclined to submit, whether such as were still independent threatened any attack upon the kingdom."

These assemblies, then, did not resemble the ancient military gatherings of the Franks, where every free man took part in the discussions. As the time of the assembly was also that of the annual review of the army, and as it preceded the opening of any campaign or occurred at the end of a campaign, the free men were still present, but they permitted the great men to deliberate apart. The dukes, bishops, counts, and abbots were alone summoned by Charlemagne to aid him with their advice. But in memory of former privileges, laws still asserted the sanction of the nation: *De his omnes consenserunt* (To this all have agreed).

Capitularies.—Sixty-five capitularies of Charlemagne are extant; they contain 1151 articles. The diversity of the topics with which they deal indicates the activity of the king and his eager desire to establish good order in his dominions. He turned his attention to every matter. At the same time as he was presiding over ecclesiastical councils and discussing with his bishops the problem of image worship or the heresy of Felix of Urgel, he regulated the most minute details in the administration of his farms, ordering that care should be taken that none of his serfs died of hunger, "that with God's help they may be saved therefrom." He opposed one of the most general tendencies of his age, the appropriation of royal demesnes by private individuals, and by his advice and counsels he warned the people against impostors and charlatans. He attempted to extinguish mendicity by compelling his nobles to support the beggars found on their estates, and if he imposed in every parish the duty of contributing to the church a tithe or tenth part of the produce of the soil, he yet divided this into three parts, the first being devoted to the maintenance and adornment of churches,

the second to the support of the poor and of travellers, and the third alone to the personal use of the priests. One of his great works was the introduction of the Gregorian chants into churches; another was the reformation of the monasteries which was undertaken by St. Benedict Anian, for since the transference of ecclesiastical property by Charles Martel to his *leudes* many secular clerks appeared who carried lances and swords, and devoted themselves only to hunting and war.

He increased the jurisdiction of the Church with the result of freeing it from royal control. He attempted to enforce upon merchants the use of just weights and measures, and established a maximum, a price above which they might not sell their goods.

He regulated military service, every free man possessing four acres being obliged to serve. Those who only held four acres were divided into two classes: the first served, the second was obliged to supply arms, horses, and necessary provisions.

He strove to repress theft by the severity of the penalties decreed against it; for the first offence a man lost an eye, for the second his nose, and for the third suffered death.

Taxes.—Since the beginning of the seventh century, public taxes had ceased to exist. The king only received that which came to him as a landowner from his numerous tenants, the produce and revenues of his private demesnes, the personal service and dues from counts and holders of royal benefices, voluntary gifts, and the tribute of conquered territory. Landowners were obliged to supply means of transport and subsistence for the king and his representatives when they passed through their estates, and were further charged with the upkeep of roads and bridges. The army supplied its own equipment and lived at its own expense and without pay: the land or benefice which the soldier had received supported him.

Public Works and Schools.—In order to effect the civilisation of Saxony and Pannonia, Charlemagne had founded bishoprics, each of which became the nucleus of an important town. He began a work which has only been completed in modern times, a canal between the Rhine and the Danube. He built a bridge at Mainz, a church at Aix-la-Chapelle, palaces at Nimwegen and Ingelheim, but he was driven to supply their decoration by pillaging Italy and despoiling Ravenna of its choicest marbles.

He restored a number of churches, demanding learning as well as piety from the priests; he created schools in the bishoprics and monasteries and in his own palace. He attended the lessons given, awarded prizes to those who showed most ability, and

shamed the sons of the nobles by advancing the sons of poor men above them. "You count on the services of your fathers," he said to them angrily; "know that they have been rewarded and that the state owes nothing to those who have not deserved recompense by personal service." To the bishops and monks he declared, "It is pleasing to God that a man should live uprightly, but it is also pleasing that he should speak wisely." Alcuin one day heard him cry, "Ah! if only I had around me twelve clerks as skilled in all knowledge as were Jerome and Augustine."

First Literary Renaissance.—Charlemagne applied himself closely to study, of which, in the eyes of his father and grandfather, a warrior had no need. "Not restricting himself to the knowledge of his mother tongue, he was anxious to learn foreign languages, and he was so well acquainted with Latin that it served him in place of his own language. As for Greek, he understood it better than he talked it. The wealth of his conversation was such that he seemed to be too fond of talking. Devoted to the liberal arts, he respected men who had distinguished themselves in that field and loaded them with honours. Peter the Deacon, an old man born at Pisa, taught him grammar; in other branches of knowledge his master was Alcuin, a Breton deacon of Saxon birth, the wisest man of his period. Under his direction Charles devoted much time and labour to the study of rhetoric, dialectic, and astronomy, acquiring ability to calculate the motions of the stars and following their course with scrupulous attention and amazing sagacity. He even tried to write, and was accustomed always to keep under his pillows tablets and copies in order that he might practise forming letters whenever he found a moment of leisure. But he met with little success in this study, which he began too late and at an unsuitable age. All the nations subject to him had not at that time a written law; he ordained that their customs should be reduced to writing. He made the same order with regard to the barbarous poems in which the deeds of the chiefs of old time were celebrated, and in this way preserved them for posterity. He also caused a grammar of his native language to be begun. In one of his capitularies he takes credit to himself for having corrected the "books of the old and new covenant, which had been corrupted by the ignorance of old copyists."

A Frankish Poem.—Unfortunately no trace of these poems which Einhard mentions has been preserved for posterity, with the doubtful exception of a fragment found inside the cover

of a manuscript in the abbey of Fulda. An example of the grand epic style, it is written in the Frankish idiom and in the characters of the eighth or early ninth century. It is clearly part of one of those long poems, of which the Nibelungen, the German Iliad, was the latest example. This relic of the ancient poetry of the Franks runs as follows :—

" I have heard that it arose from a meeting of Hildebrand and Hadebrand, of the father and the son. So the heroes put on their garb of war, they covered themselves with the array of battle, and moreover they drew on their gauntlets. As they urged their war-horses to the fray, Hildebrand, the son of Herebrand, spoke—for he was a noble man and his mind was prudent —and he asked shortly, ' Who is your father among the race of all mankind, and of what family are you ? If you can answer me, I will give you a garment of battle, triple-edged. For, O Warrior, I know all the race of men.'

" Then Hadebrand, the son of Hildebrand, answered, ' Some men of my land, men old and wise, but who now are dead, have told me that my father was called Hildebrand ; I call myself Hadebrand. Once he went towards the east ; he fled from the hatred of Odoacer ; he was with Theodoric and with many of his heroes. He left alone, in his own land, his young wife, his tiny son, his arms which had no more a master ; to the land of the east he went. For when the sorrows of my cousin Theodoric began, when he was left friendless, my father would not dwell longer with Odoacer. Valiant warriors knew my father; that bold hero fought always in the forefront of the army ; too much did he love to fight, and I know not if he be still in life.

" ' Lord of all mankind,' said Hildebrand, ' never wilt thou look down from Heaven and permit a battle between men of the same blood.' Then he took off a precious bracelet of gold, which the King of the Huns had given him, and which encircled his arm. ' Take this,' he said to his son, ' I give it to you as a present.' Hadebrand, son of Hildebrand, answered, ' It is lance in hand, point to point, that a man should win such presents. Old Hun, you are a bad comrade ; subtle spy, you would deceive me by your words, and I desire to strike you with my lance. How is it that you who are so old can find such deceits ? Sailors who ply their art on the sea of the Wends have told me of a fight wherein was killed Hildebrand, the son of Herebrand.' Hildebrand, son of Herebrand, replied, ' I see well from your armour that you have not served any famous chief and that in this realm you have done no valiant deed. Alas, alas! Almighty

God! what a destiny is mine. I have been a wanderer from my native land for sixty winters and sixty summers. I have been set always in the forefront of the battle; in no case have chains ever been placed on my feet, and now my own son must needs strike me with his glove and with his axe will slay me, or I shall be his murderer. If your arm serves you well, you may easily win from some redoubtable man his weapons, as you rob his corpse. Do so, if you believe that right is on your side, and that it is the most infamous man in all the east who would turn you from this combat for which your soul so yearns. Good comrades who watch us, in your courage judge which of us to-day can better wield his weapons, which of us is skilled to render himself master of two suits of armour.' Then they hurled their javelins, sharp-pointed, and these their shields held; then did they fall one upon another. Their stone battle axes crashed. They dealt heavy blows at their white bucklers; their armour was dented, but their bodies stood firm."

Alcuin and Einhard.—In the seventh, and in the early years of the eighth century, France was more backward than the other countries of Europe. Charlemagne was forced to search beyond his dominions for men who could meet his desires. All the masters of the palace school were foreigners; at their head was the Anglo-Saxon, Alcuin, whom Charlemagne had great difficulty in keeping with him. Later there came the Irishman, Clement; Peter of Pisa; the Lombard Paul the Deacon, who has left a history of his nation; Theodulf, a native of Spain or of Septimania and the best poet of the age, who was nicknamed Pindar in the palace school. It must, however, be confessed that Alcuin's poor verses won him the epithet of Horace, and Angilbert secured that of Homer. But they were all eclipsed by a Frank, Einhard, whom a pleasing legend has made the son-in-law of Charlemagne. He was the emperor's secretary, and after his death was concerned with the greatest affairs of the empire. His *Vita Caroli Magni* is not only an invaluable store-house of authentic facts, but is also a history, a true piece of literature. It is known that Charlemagne himself appeared in this Frankish "Academy," in which he received the epithet of David. The discussions which they carried on revealed the puerility of their knowledge, but none the less great importance attaches to the efforts of these men to escape from barbarism. Charlemagne trying to write and meeting with little success, Charlemagne becoming absent-minded as he listens to the pedantic *disputatio* of Alcuin and Pippin which is still extant,

will always be what he was in truth, the apostle of a literary renaissance, which was assuredly slow to develop, but which none the less was never wholly interrupted. From the time of Charlemagne, the world was never again cloaked in those thick clouds of darkness which had enveloped it in the seventh and eighth centuries.

Relations of Charlemagne with Haroun al-Raschid and with the Byzantine Empire.—The heirs of the *rois fainéants* were thus able to render a good account of their usurpation. The Frankish empire which had fallen had been revived and extended, and its lost authority recovered and increased. It was no empty title that Charles assumed at Rome; he was in very truth the Emperor of the West. Einhard shows him to us in his palace at Aix-la-Chapelle, ever surrounded by kings or ambassadors, who had come from the most distant lands. Egbert, afterwards King of the West Saxons, Eadulf of Northumbria, came to his court. The kings of the Asturias and of Scotland invariably styled themselves his subjects when they wrote to him, and the former rendered him an account of all his wars, and offered him a share in the booty. The brilliant and redoubtable master of western Asia, the caliph Haroun al-Raschid, sought his friendship and sent him presents, among which was an elephant, an animal which the Franks had never seen before, and a chiming clock; and the emperors of Constantinople treated with him, pursuing, according to Einhard, the Greek proverb which still exists, "Have a Frank for a friend, but not for a neighbour." On the testimony of one Byzantine historian, Charles considered marriage with the Empress Irene and the consequent union of the two empires.

The monk of St. Gall, who wrote in 884, shows in one of his stories the idea of Charlemagne's power which existed, if not among his contemporaries, at least in the following generation. Charlemagne had crossed the Alps to attack the King of the Lombards. Didier was on the walls of Pavia with Count Ogger, who had fled in order to escape punishment for some fault, and he watched with terror the approach of the Frankish army. "First of all, he saw only a thick cloud of dust; it was caused by the engines of war by which the walls of the capital were to be battered. 'Here is Charles,' cried Didier, 'with this great army.' 'No,' answered Ogger. Then there appeared a huge crowd of common soldiers. 'Surely Charles advances triumphant in the midst of this host.' 'Not yet,' replied Ogger. Next there appeared the body of guards, veteran warriors who never knew

rest. 'Now Charles is coming,' said Didier, full of terror. 'No,' answered Ogger, 'not yet.' After these came the bishops, abbots, clerks of the royal chapel, and counts. Then Didier cried, choking with fear, 'Let us go down and hide ourselves in the bowels of the earth, far from the face of this terrible foe.' 'When you see the harvest fields shaking with terror,' said Ogger, 'then you may believe that Charles is approaching.' As he said this, a dark cloud appeared, driven by the east wind, which converted the day into night. But the emperor advanced a little nearer, and the gleam of his arms lightened over Pavia a day darker than the darkest night. Then Charles himself appeared, clothed from head to foot in steel armour, a lance on his left hand, his right resting upon his invincible sword. Ogger recognised him, and struck with terror, trembled and fell, crying, 'It is he.'"

Death of Charlemagne.—It was on January 28, 814, that this great man died. His reign constituted a great and glorious effort to weld together the barbarian world and what remained of Roman civilisation, to set a term upon the chaos resultant from the invasions, and to found an organised system in which papal and imperial authority strictly united should maintain order in Church and state alike. It was a very difficult problem which was given to Charlemagne to solve, but all its difficulty appeared only after his death. The work of Charlemagne did not actually endure; the causes of its failure will soon appear. The name of this mighty genius, rough as he was, is yet encircled with imperishable glory, and remains in the mind of mankind with those of two or three great men who, if they have not accomplished more good, have yet made more stir in the world. In the case of Charles, the amount of good accomplished by him far surpasses that which was only empty fame and sterile ambition. He created modern Germany, and if the bond between nations which he wished to form was broken, his great figure towers above the Middle Ages as that of the genius of order, ever urging mankind to emerge from chaos, to find union and peace under a glorious and mighty chieftain. It is impossible to estimate how much the memory of this great emperor aided kings in restoring their power and in establishing centralised states.

CHAPTER XIV

DISMEMBERMENT OF CHARLEMAGNE'S EMPIRE OWING TO THE RISING OF THE NATIONS (814–843)

Louis the Pious (814-840).—Charlemagne had been able to found a vast empire ; but it was beyond his power to promote among these peoples, differing in origin, language, and customs, identity of interests and feelings or a common desire to remain united in one large political family. It possessed material unity, but moral unity was lacking, and that alone is true and lasting.

"The brilliancy with which Charles outshone all other monarchs," said the monk of St. Gall, "had induced Gauls, Aquitainians, Burgundians, Alemanni, and Bavarians to glory in being confounded under the common name of Frank." When Charlemagne was dead, all that had lent an appearance of honour to their servitude was destroyed : each thought only of himself and dragged at his bonds. The private ambitions of princes of the imperial family assisted the dismemberment of nations, those of great landowners and of imperial ministers favoured the subdivision of fiefs.

Charlemagne recognised the necessity of giving satisfaction to those peoples among whom the spirit of nationality was strongest, and had crowned his three sons : Louis as King of the Aquitainians, Pippin of the Italians, and Charles of the Germans. The two last died before their father, which cancelled that partition ; but Charlemagne later granted Italy to Bernhard, son of Pippin. He intended these kings to be docile lieutenants; so they remained while he lived, but when the strong hand which held together this medley of nations lay cold in death, they parted from each other. Peoples desired kings, kings desired independence. To curb these ambitious projects a strong will was needed, and he who received the unwieldy heritage of the powerful master of the west was the feeblest of men.

Louis was then thirty-six years of age. He was pious and upright, but his piety was that of a monk, not of a king, and his justice readily degenerated into weakness or cruelty. He began by deeds of reparation which seemed to the old advisers of Charlemagne an imprudent surrender of the rights of the empire. He gave back to men who had been despoiled of

them their liberty and estates; he once more allowed to the Frisians and Saxons the right of inheritance of which they had been deprived, and permitted the Romans in 816 to appoint a new pope, without waiting for imperial confirmation. Then, when Stephen IV. consecrated him in France, he allowed him to pronounce words which revealed the wish of the holy see to appropriate the right of disposing of the imperial crown: "Peter glories in making this gift to you, for you assure him of the enjoyment of his free rights."

At the same time, Louis effected strict reforms at court, where during the declining years of Charlemagne licentiousness had set in; he severely punished the guilty, and in the hope of reducing the power of the aristocracy and calling back to political life the lower-class free men who were increasingly dominated by the great landowners, he ordered that all free men should take an immediate oath of fealty to him. In this way he angered many without doing much good; then to soothe their discontent he lavished benefices on them, giving them perpetual possession, a system which was only too readily followed by his successors, and which reduced them to beggary. For there being now no public taxes such as there had been two centuries ago, the prince's sole revenue consisted in that which came to him from his demesnes, and in alienating his estates, he alienated also his revenue.

Partition among the Sons of the Emperor (817).—At the Assembly or Council of Aix-la-Chapelle in 817, a law was made to establish uniformity in the monastic order which was placed entirely under the rule of St. Benedict. The emperor also made a partition of his lands: Aquitaine was granted to Pippin, Bavaria to Louis, while his eldest son Lothaire was associated with him in the empire. Without his authorisation his brothers could neither enter into war, nor conclude a treaty, nor cede a town.

Revolt and Death of Bernhard (817).—Bernhard, who had been made King of Italy by his grandfather, and who, as the heir of Charlemagne's eldest son, aspired to a more exalted position, alleged that he was injured by this partition. The peoples and cities beyond the mountains, who already dreamed of freeing themselves from the barbarians in order to enter upon a free and national existence, shared in his resentment. "The emperor was returning from a great hunt in the forest of the Vosges to spend the winter at Aix-la-Chapelle when he heard that his nephew Bernhard, foolishly following the advice of perverse

men, had revolted; that already all the princes and cities of Italy had sworn fealty to him; in short, that all roads by which that kingdom might be entered were closed and fortified against him. This sad news being confirmed by faithful witnesses, the emperor collected troops from Gaul, from Germany, from all sides, and arrived at Châlons with a very large army. Bernhard, recognising his inability to stand against such forces, placed himself in the hands of the emperor, laid down his arms, and fell at his feet, confessing his error. His example was followed by the lords of his kingdom; a crowd of clergy and laity had shared in his crime, and chief among those who were implicated were the bishops of Milan, Cremona, and Orleans. When the heads of the conspiracy had been arrested, the emperor spared the lives of Bernhard and his accomplices, which should have been forfeit according to the law of the Franks, but he had their eyes torn out. Bernhard died a few days after this punishment. The bishops were deprived and imprisoned in monasteries; as for the rest of the rebels, they were either banished or tonsured. Among the latter were three young brothers of the emperor (Astronome)."

Repression of Insurrections.—The attempt made by Italy was premature. The Frankish nation held too firmly to this empire which it had founded to allow it so soon to fall in ruins, and it threw itself with enthusiasm into all wars which might secure its preservation. The death of Charlemagne had been the signal for a general uprising among all tributary and hostile peoples. The Slavs had entered Saxony; the Avars of Pannonia had risen in revolt; the Bretons had emerged from their peninsula; the Gascons destroyed a Frankish army and the Arabs of Spain invaded Septimania; while the Saracens ravaged the south coasts and the Northmen those of the north and west. All these attacks were repulsed; the rebels were once more reduced under the Frankish yoke, and Louis seemed for a time to wield the imperial sceptre in as worthy a manner as did his father.

Public Penitence of Louis (822).—Soon, however, the distressing weakness of the prince became patent to all. "In the year 822 he called a general assembly at a place named Attigny. Having summoned to this assembly the bishops, abbots, ecclesiastics, and great men of his kingdom, his first care was to reconcile himself with his brothers whom he had forced to be tonsured, and afterwards with all those whom he had injured. Then he made a public confession of his faults, and submitted of his own

accord to do penance for all his sins, both against his nephew Bernhard and against others."

Thus was seen the impressive spectacle of a powerful man publicly owning his faults and redeeming them by penance, a spectacle which Theodosius had once offered to the Roman world. But after having humiliated himself in the cathedral of Milan, Theodosius had appeared as stronger both in his own estimation and in that of his subjects, since it was before God alone and under the weight of a remorseful conscience that he had bowed his head. Louis went out of the palace of Attigny his reputation diminished, his office degraded, because it was from a political body, from a rival authority, that he had received absolution. From that time all knew how far they could go with such a man.

Deposition and Restoration of Louis (830–834).—In 823, there was born to the emperor by his second wife Judith a son whom he named Charles. The mother wished this child also to have a kingdom, and the father, cancelling in 829 the partition of 817, gave him Alemannia. No sooner had he done this than his elder sons stirred up the people, a vast conspiracy was formed, and the emperor, abandoned by all, fell into the hands of the rebels. They forced the empress to take the veil, tonsured her brothers, and imprisoned their father with the monks, hoping that the latter would persuade him of his own accord to embrace the monastic life. Lothaire, the head of the insurrection, hoped thus to free himself from his father without violence. But the monks were well aware that they would gain more by placing their penitent on the throne than by keeping him with them in the cloister. They embarked on another conspiracy, sent secret messages to Louis and Pippin in which the emperor promised to increase their kingdoms if they should restore him to his throne. Already chafing under the superiority of Lothaire, they consented, and the assembly of Nimwegen which, called together in the midst of the eastern Franks, desired the preservation of the empire, gave back to Louis his authority (830).

Second Deposition of Louis (833).—Louis did not profit by this lesson. Once again seated on his throne, he was no wiser in his government of the empire. Intrigues were renewed. He deposed Pippin and gave his kingdom of Aquitaine to the son of Judith; his other sons interpreted this proceeding as a threat against themselves. They once more united, and with three armies attacked their father near Colmar in Alsace. Pope Gregory IV. accompanied them. Louis had considerable forces,

and a battle seemed inevitable. At the last moment, however, his army was seduced. The pope threatened to excommunicate all who fought against Lothaire, and the emperor himself sent away those who remained faithful to him, saying, "I do not wish any one to die for me, go over to my sons"; and he, with Judith and Charles, placed himself in their hands. Nevertheless, this treachery left a deep impression on the minds of the men of that period, who named the spot the "Field of Lies," Lügenfeld.

The victors insulted the age and dignity of their father by subjecting him to public degradation. They forced him to read before all the people in the church of St. Médard of Soissons a long recital of his faults, accusing himself of having handed over his people to traitors and the state to murder and pillage, of having made new divisions in the empire and having caused civil war. Then the bishops solemnly removed his military belt and clothed him in the robe of a penitent.

Second Restoration of Louis (834).—This humiliation of the empire in the person of the emperor revived the party of Louis. His patient resignation and the revolting harshness of his sons excited popular compassion. Moreover, the brothers were on no better terms with each other than they had been on the occasion of Louis's first deposition. If Louis and Pippin did not wish to be despoiled in order to profit Charles, they certainly objected to obeying Lothaire, who aimed at maintaining imperial authority undivided; and in the fact that their subjects were reluctant to remain within the empire, they found sure support and a devoted army. Thus they freed Louis from the monastery in which he was confined by Lothaire, and restored him to power (834). But he declined to resume the insignia of his office until he had secured the consent of the bishops.

New Blunders: New Wars: Death of Louis (840).—The emperor having left the cloister, for which he was so well fitted, fell again into his former errors. In his blind predilection for his youngest child, he forgot that the root of all his misfortunes was the partition which he had made during his lifetime between his sons. In 837 he gave Burgundy, Provence, and Septimania to Charles. Pippin, King of Aquitaine, dying in the following year, his children were deprived, and Charles received that kingdom also. Then Louis the German and Lothaire, whose dominions had been reduced, that of the former to Bavaria, the latter to Italy, took up arms. The emperor, to avoid fighting both, negotiated with Lothaire (839). He gave up

to him all the provinces in the district of the Jura and the valley of the Rhône east of the Meuse, with the title of emperor; the western provinces were to be the share of Judith's son, Louis the German retaining only Bavaria. The latter, supported by all Germany, protested against this unjust partition; and the old emperor spent his last days in this impious war. He died on the Rhine, near Mainz: "I forgive him," he said to the bishops who pleaded for the rebel, "but let him know that he caused my death." The Middle Ages, more affected by his virtues as a man than by his faults as a king, have been full of leniency to the memory of Louis the Pious.

Battle of Fontanet (841) and Treaty of Verdun (843).—Since the death of Charlemagne, the empire which he had founded had been the scene of constant disturbance, calling to mind some giant writhing in the agony of death. Each prince aimed at securing a kingdom and every important section of the empire desired a king of its own in order to form an independent state. In 817 the first partition took place; there were others in 829, 837, and 839. At last, the peoples of the empire, weary of this perpetual rending, met to decide the question once and for all at the momentous Battle of Fontanet, near Auxerre. All the tribes of Germany under Louis the German, and the Neustrians, Aquitainians, Burgundians, and Provençals under Charles the Bald, fought side by side to overthrow the political order established by Charles Martel, Pippin, and Charlemagne, for the benefit of the Austrasian Franks. The latter, that is to say, nearly the whole of the Frankish population established between the Seine and the Rhine, who only defended their own cause in upholding that of the empire, were seconded by the Italians, who had adopted the new emperors as the legitimate heirs of Marcus Aurelius and of Trajan. They were commanded by Lothaire, eldest son of Louis the Pious (841). He bore the title of emperor and wished his brothers to be mere lieutenants.

Both armies prepared for this battle with a kind of religious contemplation, showing that the peoples would regard the issue of this last struggle as a judgment of God. "All hope of peace being removed," says Nithard, an historian of that time, himself a grandson of Charlemagne, "Louis and Charles sent word to Lothaire that on the following day, at the second hour of the day, they would come to the judgment of Almighty God. Lothaire, as was his custom, treated the envoys with insolence, answering that they would see that he knew how to look to himself. At daybreak, Louis and Charles broke

up their camp and occupied, with a third of their army, the summit of an eminence bordering on the camp of Lothaire, and awaited his advance. Then ensued a great and fierce conflict on the banks of a small river, in which Lothaire was routed and fled with all his men. After the battle, Louis and Charles took council together as to the treatment of the fugitives. The two kings, having compassion on their brother and his people, proposed to display to them at this time the mercy of God. The rest of the army having agreed to this, they all broke off the action and returned to their camp about midday. On the morrow, which was Sunday, after the celebration of mass, they buried friends and enemies alike, and tended all the wounded with equal kindness to the best of their ability. Then the kings and the army, grieved that they should have come to blows with a brother and with Christians, asked the bishops what they should do.

"All the bishops met in council, and it was declared in that assembly that the fight had been entered upon in the cause of justice, which the judgment of God had clearly proved, and that accordingly, whoever had taken part in the fray, either by advice or action, should, as the instrument of the Will of God, be exempt from all shadow of blame."

These details have been given in order to point out the influence which the bishops had acquired, and the novel character of these wars in which the old Frankish ferocity played no part. But increased humanity involved a decline in courage. These warriors, in the midst of whom councils were held, later allowed small bands of Northmen to ravage their country with impunity, like a pack of famished wolves, before which all fled in terror.

The Oath of Strasburg (841). — Thanks to the Christian sentiments of the victors, or to the resistance of the vanquished, which was greater than the historian would have us believe, the battle of Fontanet was far from being decisive, and the war continued. Louis and Charles met at Strasburg to cement their union against Lothaire, and, before their soldiers, swore to an alliance, one in Teuton or German, the other in the Roman tongue or French. The oath of Strasburg is the first example on record of the French language formed by the mixture, in unequal proportions, of the three idioms, Celtic, Latin, and German, which were spoken in Gaul, Latin easily predominating over the other two. This alliance was celebrated by military festivities, in which some have found the origin of tournaments,

though in actual fact they resembled far more nearly the gorgeous fantasias which occur to-day among the Arabs of Algeria.

Treaty of Verdun : The Empire is divided into Three Kingdoms (843).—It was quite evident that Louis and Charles were firmly resolved to break up the empire. Lothaire therefore decided to treat with them. One hundred and ten commissioners travelled through all the provinces and drew up a table in order that a just partition might be made. It was accomplished at Verdun (843). The three principal races of the empire, the Germans, Gallo-Franks, and Italians, separated for ever, the first under Louis, the second under Charles, and the third under Lothaire. The name of emperor, a title without power, remained attached to the possession of Rome and Italy. But in order to render the share of Lothaire less unequal, they ceded to him a long, narrow strip of territory which stretched from the Meuse to the Rhine, from the Saône and the Rhône to the Alps (Belgium, Lotharingia or Lorraine, county of Burgundy, Dauphiné, and Provence). This treaty reduced Gaul by one-third and cut it off for the first time from its natural boundary of the Rhine and the Alps. The efforts of Francis I., Henry II., Richelieu, Louis XIV., and the revolution did not altogether succeed in recovering the lost frontier. Charles the Bald, who signed that agreement, was, in truth, the first king of modern France, as Louis the German was the first king of Germany. As for Lothaire, he continued the existence of the kingdom of Italy, which was destined so often to die and to be born again.

Thus was accomplished the rending of the empire. Some men of exalted mind mourned for the unity of Christian Europe, which had been destroyed by the Treaty of Verdun. A touching testimony has come down to us in the following verses of the Church of Lyons:—

"A noble empire flourished under a brilliant diadem ; there was but one prince and one people ; all the towns had judges and laws. The zeal of the priests was maintained by frequent councils ; young men pored unceasingly over the holy books, and the inclination of children was bent to the study of letters. Goodwill was preserved by love on one side, fear on the other ; and the Frankish nation shone in the eyes of all the world. Foreign kingdoms, the Greeks, barbarians, and the senate of Latium sent ambassadors to her. The race of Romulus, Rome herself, the mother of kingdoms, submitted to this nation. It was there that her chief, upheld by the strength of Christ, received the apostolic gift of the diadem. Happy man had he

known his good fortune, the empire which had Rome for her citadel and he who bears the keys of Heaven for her founder ! Now torn asunder, this great power has lost at once her glory and the name of empire ; the kingdom, but lately so united, is now divided into three, and there is no one who can be regarded as emperor ; in place of king, one sees a kinglet, in place of kingdom, the fragment of a kingdom. The common weal is no more considered ; each is absorbed in his own interest. Man is careful for many things, he does but forget God. The shepherds of the Lord, skilled at arranging meetings with one another, cannot hold their synods in the midst of such division. There is no longer an assembly of the people, there are no laws ; an embassy would come there in vain, for there is no court. Now that the alliance is broken, what will become of the peoples bordering on the Danube, the Rhine, the Rhône, the Loire, and the Po, all formerly united by bands of concord ? They will be tormented by miserable strife. For what purpose has the anger of God caused her to suffer all these evils ? There is hardly a soul who thinks of this with horror, who ponders on these events and is cast down. In the midst of the tearing asunder of the empire they rejoice, and call an order of things peace in which none of the blessings of peace are enjoyed."

CHAPTER XV

DISMEMBERMENT OF THE KINGDOM OF FRANCE BY THE USURPATIONS OF THE LEUDES (843–887)

Charles the Bald (840–877).—Up to this point the history of the Gauls, the Gallo-Romans, and the Franks has been followed ; from the date of the Treaty of Verdun the history of the French begins. France, at this time, had received all the races which were destined to make up her population except that of the Northmen (who, however, had already appeared on the coasts and had there established themselves, though only in small numbers), and all the elements, Celtic, Roman, Christian, and Germanic, from which combination her civilisation originated. This mingling of races was already so advanced that it was hardly possible to distinguish the Gallo-Roman from the Frank, the civilised from the barbarian. They were all alike in manners and customs and their language was almost identical. The French tongue appeared officially at the Treaty of Verdun ; the

right to it ceased to be personal and became local; Frankish customs replaced Roman or barbarian codes; there were no slaves and few free men; soon the nation was to be composed almost wholly of serfs and lords.

But this France no longer extended over the whole of Gaul, the Treaty of Verdun having thrown back her boundaries to the farther side of the Scheldt and the Meuse, behind the Saône and Rhône, and the population established within these narrow limits found them yet too extensive; they wished to live apart, every man for himself, and no longer to submit to a vast dominion which ground them down and which they did not understand. Charlemagne's empire was split up into three kingdoms, France was shortly to be divided into feudal principalities, some of which were actually to aspire to the rôle of independent states. The chiefs of the Basques and Bretons were to claim the title of kings.

Charles the Bald, son of Judith and Louis the Pious, King of France since 840, was nothing but an ambitious nonentity. He—like Charlemagne—had much time at his disposal, for he reigned thirty-seven years; he was unable to make use of it. It is true that his embarrassments were many. During the very year when men were struggling for and against the empire at Fontanet, Asnar, Count of Jacca, assumed the sovereignty of Navarre and the Northmen burned Rouen; in 843 they pillaged Nantes, Saintes, and Bordeaux. At the same time the Aquitainians attempted to secure a national king; the Bretons found theirs in Noménoë whom Charles caused to be excommunicated by his bishops, but who defeated his lieutenants; Septimania found a chief in Bernhard; the Saracens and Greek pirates ravaged the south, while the Northmen devastated the north and west; finally, to complete the miseries of this unhappy century, the Hungarians, successors of the Huns and the Avars, arrived from the east.

The Northmen.—These redoubtable pirates were every year driven by hunger, thirst for pillage, and love of adventure from the barren regions of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. In three days an east wind drove their two-sailed vessels to the mouth of the Seine. Each fleet was under the command of a *konung*, or king. He, however, only ruled them by sea and in battle; at banquets the whole band sat at the same table and the horns filled with beer were passed from hand to hand, no man taking precedence over his fellows. The *sea king* was followed everywhere with fidelity and always obeyed with zeal, because he

was known to be the bravest of the brave, the one who never slept under a roof or emptied a tankard beside a sheltered hearth.

"He could guide his vessel as a good horseman manages his steed. To the ascendancy which courage and ability gained for him was added a certain superiority born of superstition; he was initiated into the science of the runes. He knew mysterious characters which graven upon swords ensured victory, and others which inscribed on the sterns of vessels and upon the oars prevented shipwreck. Their king was merely *primus inter pares;* their casual allegiance sat lightly upon them as also did the weight of their coats of mail, which they hoped soon to exchange for an equal weight in gold; the Danish pirates went gaily along the *road of the swans* as the old national poems express it. Sometimes they coasted the land and watched for their enemy in straits, bays, and small anchorages, which gave them the name of Vikings or children of the creeks; sometimes they rushed in pursuit of them across the ocean. The violent storms of the North Sea dispersed and broke up their frail crafts; they did not all rejoin the vessel of the chief at the rallying sign, but those who survived their shipwrecked companions continued to be full of confidence and free from anxiety, mocking the winds and waves which had failed to harm them. 'The force of the tempest helps the arms of our oarsmen,' they sang, 'the hurricane is at our service; it drives us where we would go.'" (Aug. Thierry.)

Often amidst the clash of arms and the sight of blood some of them would be seized with a mad fury which redoubled their strength and rendered them as insensible to wounds as if they beheld opening out before them a vision of the palace of their god, Odin, and the dazzling halls of Walhalla. Others, while suffering torture, affected an indomitable energy and sang, in the midst of carnage, their song of death. Thus the famous Lodbrog from the depths of a pit filled with vipers proudly flung these words at his enemies:—

"We have fought with the sword! I was yet young when in the East, in the straits of Eirar, we caused a river of blood to flow for the wolves, and invited the yellow-legged birds to a great feast of corpses. The sea was red as a newly opened wound, and the crows swam in blood."

"We have fought with the sword. I saw near Aienlane (England) innumerable corpses loading the decks of the ships; we continued the battle for six whole days without overcoming the

enemy; on the seventh, at sunrise, we celebrated the mass of spears, and Walthiof was forced to yield."

"We fought with the sword! Torrents of blood rained from our weapons at Partohyrth (Pesth); there was none left in the carcasses for the vultures; the bow twanged and the arrows buried themselves in the coats of mail, sweat trickled down the blades of the spears; they poured poison into the wounds and mowed down the warriors like the hammer of Odin."

"We have fought with the sword! Death clutches me, the bite of the vipers is deep; I feel their teeth far down in my breast. Soon, I hope, the sword will avenge me in the blood of Ælla. My sons will groan at the news of my death; their faces will flame with anger; such bold warriors will not rest until I am avenged."

"I must make an end, for here is the Dysir whom Odin sends to conduct me to his glorious palace. I go with the Ases to drink mede in the place of honour. The hours of my life glide away, and my smile braves death."

Religious mania was joined to this warlike madness; they loved to shed the blood of priests and to stable their horses in the churches. When they had ravaged a Christian country, they would say, "We have sung for them the mass of spears; it began in the early morning and lasted until night." Charlemagne had seen from afar these terrible invaders; under Louis the Pious they became bolder. In 836 some wintered in the island of Walcheron, and from there they put under contribution the riverside districts of the Meuse and the Wahal. From 843 they came annually. They entered by the mouths of the rivers, along the Scheldt, Somme, Seine, Loire, and Gironde, until they reached the interior of the country. A number of towns, even the most important, as, for instance, Orleans and Paris, were taken and pillaged, Charles proving to be incapable of defending them. All the land was ravaged from the Rhine to the Adour and from the ocean to the Cevennes and the Vosges. They even made it their custom not to return to their own country for the winter. They settled in the island of Oyssel, north of Rouen, at Noirmoutiers, at the mouth of the Loire, and in the river itself on the island of Bière, near Saint Florent. It was to that place that they carried their booty, and from there they started on fresh expeditions.

Ediet of Mersen (847).—The chroniclers, not understanding this apathy in the Frankish people who were formerly so brave and who now allowed themselves to be pillaged by a few adven-

turers, can only explain it by supposing that there had been an appalling massacre at Fontanet.

> "Là perit de France la flor
> Et des baronz tuit lui meillor
> Ainsi trovèrent Paenz terre
> Vuide de gent, bonne à conquerre."

There is some truth in these words. Charlemagne's fifty-three expeditions had worn out the Frankish people and his conquests had scattered it over three kingdoms, since they were invariably accompanied by the settlement of some of his warriors. The dissensions of the sons of Louis the Pious supplied the finishing stroke. The free man now disappeared. This was the result partly of the heavy mortality in the frequent wars, partly of the fact that, amid the growing anarchy, almost all the free men had already abandoned a liberty which condemned them to live in perilous isolation, and had become the vassals of such as were able to protect them. The Edict of Mersen provided: "That every free man should be allowed to choose a lord, either the king or one of his vassals, and that no vassal of the king should be obliged to follow him to war except against a foreign enemy." Thus the subjects could bargain over obedience and the king in civil war was left unarmed, powerless. Since he was as unable to compel obedience from the great as he was to protect the weak, the latter grouped themselves round the former. The king's vassals diminished, those of the nobles increased. On all sides, national feeling was lost in wholly selfish interests. Rouen hardly troubled over the misfortunes of Bordeaux, nor Saintes over those of Paris; and thus it was that at this epoch, as during the last days of the Roman Empire, and for the same cause, the absence of a vigorous common sentiment, patriotism, made it possible for small bands to ravage a large country with impunity. Charles attempted to keep them away by giving them gold; it was the surest means of attracting them. The Roman Empire had acted in like manner to the barbarians, and it is well known with what success.

Associates of the Northmen.—The true Northmen could not be really numerous, for they came from afar and by sea. "But," says a chronicler of that period, "many of the inhabitants, forgetting that they had been made regenerate in the holy water of baptism, fell headlong into the dark errors of the pagans, ate with them the flesh of horses sacrificed to Odin and Thor, and with them took part in their crimes."

And these renegades were most to be feared. They acted as

guides to the invaders, knew how to baffle the ruses to which their fellow-citizens resorted to mock the greed of the barbarians, and had still less respect and pity than these for the creed and the people whom they had deserted. Sometimes, even, certain nobles were bribed by the Northmen not to interfere with their expeditions, receiving a tithe of the spoil of France.

Hastings, the Northman.—The most terrible of these pirates was Hastings, who, from 845 to 850, ravaged the country bordering on the Loire, sacked Bordeaux and Saintes, threatened Tarbes, in which town a victory over these barbarians is still commemorated, rounded Spain, and, still pillaging, reached the coasts of Italy. He had been attracted by the fame and riches of the capital of the Christian world; but he mistook Luna for Rome. Hastings sent word to the count and the bishop that his companions, conquerors of the Franks, wished no ill to the people of Italy, that they wished only to repair their damaged ships, and that he himself, weary of his roving life, desired to find rest in the bosom of the Church. The bishop and the count refused him nothing; Hastings was even baptised; but the gates of the town remained closed. Some time afterwards, the camp rang with lamentations. Hastings was dangerously ill; envoys were sent with this news and to declare at the same time that the dying man intended to leave all his booty to the Church on condition that his body was buried in consecrated ground. The anguished cries of the Northmen presently announced the death of their chief. They were allowed to bear his corpse into the town, and preparations were made for his burial in the church itself. But at the moment when the corpse was placed in the middle of the choir, Hastings suddenly sprang up and knocked down the bishop, while his companions, producing their hidden weapons, massacred priests and soldiers. Hastings, now master of Luna, discovered his mistake. He was informed that Rome was a long way off and that it would not be so easily taken. He again set sail with his booty and reappeared after some months at the mouth of the Loire.

Charles the Bald placed part of the country between the Seine and the Loire under the rule of Robert the Strong, ancestor of the Capetians, in order to oppose a more effective resistance to the Northmen and Bretons, a great number of the latter having fallen into the habit of joining the pirates. Robert twice vanquished the Bretons and defeated a body of Northmen who were again laden with booty from La Brie and the town of Meaux. Hastings met this valiant chief on his return

from Italy. He had just sacked Le Mans, when Robert and the Duke of Aquitaine overtook him at Brissarthe (Pont-sur-Sarthe), near Angers. The pagans were only four hundred strong, half Northmen, half Bretons; on Robert's approach they flung themselves into a church which they then barricaded. This happened in the evening. On the following morning the French renewed the attack. Robert had already laid aside his helmet and coat of mail when the Northmen suddenly flung open the doors and hurled themselves upon his scattered company. Robert rallied his men, forced the enemy back into the church, and attempted to follow them. But he was fighting bare-headed and with his breast unprotected; he was mortally wounded on the very threshold. Duke Rainulf fell beside him whom the chroniclers of that period describe as the "Maccabeus" of France (886). Hastings, delivered from this formidable adversary, ascended the whole length of the Loire and penetrated as far as Clermont-Ferrand. Only by the cession to him of the county of Chartres was it found possible to free France from his attacks. Later, at the age of seventy, he abandoned that possession in order to renew his career of adventure.

Beginning of Great Fiefs.—The Northmen created the greatest but not the only difficulty of Charles the Bald. Noménoë the Breton repulsed all his attacks, caused himself to be crowned king, leaving his title to his son, Hérispoë. The Aquitainians had chosen as their ruler the son of their late king, Pippin II., whom Charles the Bald had dispossessed. Expelled as a result of his vices, Pippin allied with the Northmen and Saracens to plunder his former subjects, but was taken and imprisoned in a cloister. Charles regained Aquitaine for a time, then lost it, then recovered it once more and gave it to one of his sons. But already the true masters of the country were Raymond, Count of Toulouse, who also reigned over Rouergue and Quercy; Walgrin, Count of Angoulême; Sanco Mitara, Duke of Gascony, whose capital was Bordeaux; Bernard, Marquis of Septimania; Rainulf, Duke of Aquitaine and Count of Poitiers; and Bernard Plantevelue, Count of Auvergne, all of whom rendered their positions hereditary. North of the Loire, Charles had even been obliged to constitute for Robert the Strong the great duchy of France from which sprang the third reigning house; north of the Somme, the county of Flanders in favour of his son-in-law, Baldwin Bras de Fer; and between the Loire and the Saône the powerful duchy of Burgundy for Richard the Justiciar. Thus, under the

grandson of Charlemagne, not only was the empire divided into kingdoms, but the kingdoms were already splitting up into fiefs.

Edict of Pistes (862).—But Charles made an effort to retain in his service and in that of the state the class of free men. In 862, the Edict of Pistes ordered a census to be taken of men bound to military service. The most severe penalties were declared against those who deprived them of their horses and weapons, and against the free men themselves who, to evade this duty, entered the Church.

Foreign Wars.—Although so weak at home, this prince none the less aimed at foreign conquest; this king who could not sustain his own crown attempted to win others.

On the death of the Emperor Lothaire in 855, his inheritance had been divided among his three sons. Italy fell to the eldest, Lotharingia to the second, and Provence to the third. The last only survived until 863, the King of Lotharingia only until 869, and neither left an heir. Charles the Bald attempted on their death to seize their dominions. His designs miscarried in 863, but in 870 he succeeded, and partitioned Lorraine with his brother Louis the German. In spite of his weakness and the disgrace of his reign, Charles the Bald restored to France at least in one direction some of the territory of which she had been deprived by the Treaty of Verdun.

Edict of Kiersy (877).—Instead of continuing this work, Charles now coveted the imperial crown which became vacant in 875. He went to receive it at Rome from the pope, assumed that of the kingdom of the Lombards at Milan on his way back, and his brother Louis the German having died, attempted to unite that state with his own—Germany to France.

At that very moment, the Northmen took Rouen from him, he was defeated on the Rhine, and Italy also slipped from his grasp. To persuade his vassals to support him in this quarrel, he assembled them at the diet of Kiersy-sur-Oise, and signed a capitulary which recognised hereditary right in all fiefs and offices. This act deprived royalty at once of powers which it had conferred and of estates which it had temporarily given up. It rendered public functions hereditary. Charles died during this Italian expedition at the foot of Mont Cenis.

Louis the Stammerer (877–879): Louis III. and Carloman (879–884).—Louis the Stammerer, son of Charles the Bald and King of Aquitaine since 867, succeeded him as King of France.

He was consecrated at Compiègne by Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims, the most eminent French ecclesiastic of that time. In order to conciliate the nobles, he ceded to them a part of the demesnes which yet remained to the crown, and similar grants were made on a lavish scale by his two sons, Louis III. and Carloman, who reigned conjointly after his premature death. Each day the situation became worse. In 879, Duke Boso caused himself to be proclaimed King of Provence, and they were unable to overthrow him. Charles the Bald had in 870 acquired half of Lorraine; they abandoned it and that country returned to Germany. Two victories over the Northmen, notably that of Saucourt near Vimeu, shed a certain halo over these princes. But those momentary advantages did not prevent the depredations from beginning afresh. In 882 the celebrated Hastings forced them to give up to him the county of Chartres, and Carloman gave money to the others to induce them to leave the country. "They promised peace," said the chronicler sadly, "for as many years as they were allowed a thousand pounds weight of silver." The two kings died within a short time of each other as a result of accidents; Louis in 882 and Carloman two years later.

Charles the Fat, King and Emperor (884–887).—They had a brother, Charles the Simple; the nobles preferred to him a grandson of Louis the Pious, Charles the Fat, at that time Emperor and King of Germany. The whole of Charlemagne's inheritance once more became united in his hands. But times had changed. This man who was laden with so many crowns was not even able to intimidate the Northmen.

Siege of Paris (885–886).—He had already ceded Frisia to one of their chiefs. Another, the famous Rollo, a kind of giant who always travelled on foot, there being no horse strong enough to bear him, took Rouen and Pontoise and killed the Duke of Le Mans. At the approach of his compatriots, Hastings, the former pirate, now Count of Chartres, hurried to join them and they all marched on Paris, which they had already pillaged three times. But Paris was already fortified. Massive towers guarded the bridges (Petit-Pont and Pont-au-Change) which joined the Ile de la Cité to the suburbs on the two river banks. The Seine was thus barred to the seven hundred great ships which the Northmen wished to take as far as Burgundy, a province they had not yet entered. The inhabitants, encouraged by Gozlin, their bishop, and by Eudes, their count, son of Robert the Strong, resisted

for eighteen months. The attack was begun on November 26, 885. The Northmen attacked the tower of Grand-Pont, on the right bank, which was in an unfinished condition ; and two days of bloody fighting ensued. Bishop Gozlin was wounded by a javelin. The Northmen, repelled, established themselves round the church of St. Germain l'Auxerrois in an entrenched camp. They had learnt from deserters all that was still known of Roman military science. They first constructed a movable tower of three stories ; but when they attempted to approach the walls, the Parisians killed those who pushed it with arrows. Then they advanced with battering-rams, some under light shields covered with untanned hides to protect them from the fire, others formed a tortoise with thin shields. Arrived at the edge of the trench, to fill it up they flung in earth, faggots, trees, and even the corpses of their prisoners whom they slaughtered before the eyes of the besieged. While the more distant Northmen dispersed the defenders of the battlements with a hail of arrows and bullets, those nearest the wall shook the tower with the battering-rams ; all these efforts failed. The Parisians poured over them great streams of boiling oil, wax, and liquid pitch ; their catapults hurled enormous stones which smashed through the mantlets and linked shields, or else they lifted those with iron hooks and uncovered the assailants, who were instantly riddled with darts. Three fire ships, hurled against the bridge, were stopped by the piers on which it rested and failed to set it on fire.

This unlooked-for resistance had lasted over two months, when a sudden rise of the river carried away a part of Petit-Pont in the night of February 6, 886. The Northmen at once rushed upon the tower on the left bank, which was now isolated from the town. Only twelve men remained in it. They defended it for a whole day, then retiring on the debris of the bridge, they continued the fight. At length they yielded on condition that their lives should be spared. But no sooner had the barbarians got these brave men in their power than they killed them. One of them, a man of noble mien, appeared to be a chieftain. They decided to spare him ; but he insisted on sharing to the end the lot of his companions. "You will never obtain a ransom for my head," he said to them, and he forced them to kill him.

But the great courage of the Parisians stirred the whole country, and some were emboldened to imitate it. Several bands

of pirates who had left the siege were beaten, and Duke Heinrich, the adviser of Emperor Charles, attempted to throw a relieving force into the town, but the pagans still maintained the blockade. Misery reached its height in the city, many people died. Bishop Gozlin and the Count of Anjou "passed to the Lord." Brave Count Eudes escaped to urge the arrival of the emperor; as soon as he saw his army on the march, he returned and shut himself in with his people. The promised help at last appeared, led by Duke Heinrich. Wishing himself to reconnoitre the ground, he advanced too far; his horse fell into one of the hidden pitfalls of the enemy, and he was killed. His followers disbanded; once more Paris was forsaken. The Northmen took it for granted that despondency now reigned and that they would easily overcome an exhausted people. They attempted a general assault, but were repulsed on all sides; they tried to set fire to the gate of the great tower, and built an enormous pile against it; but the Parisians made a sudden sally, drove back the assailants, and extinguished the fire.

After many weary months, Charles arrived at length with an army on the heights of Montmartre. The Parisians, full of enthusiasm, waited for the signal to fight, when they were told that the emperor had again purchased the retreat of an enemy whom they had almost conquered, and had given them permission to winter in Burgundy, in other words, to ravage that province. They refused to be implicated in any way in this shameful treaty, and when the ships of the Northmen came up to pass the bridges, they refused them passage. The pirates were obliged to drag their ships over the land and to make a long detour in order to avoid the heroic city (887).

That year Paris gloriously won her title of the capital of France, and her chief, the brave Count Eudes, became the founder of the first national dynasty.

Deposition of Charles the Fat (887).—The contrast between the courage of that little city and the cowardice of the emperor turned every one against that unworthy prince. He was deposed at the diet of Tribur (887), and from that day Germany, Italy, and France have never had a common ruler. The Carolingian empire was irrevocably torn asunder, and the scattered pieces served to form seven kingdoms; France, Navarre, Cisjurane Burgundy, Transjurane Burgundy, Lorraine, Italy, and Germany.

Establishment of the Feudal System.—It was not the empire

alone that was dismembered, but also the kingdom and kingship. The hereditary right of fiefs and benefices had covered France with a multitude of petty kings. Thus, in 887, the Duke of Gascony possessed almost all the country south of the Garonne: the Counts of Toulouse, Auvergne; of Périgord, Poitou; and Berry, the provinces between the Garonne and the Loire. The whole country north and east of the latter river belonged to the Count of Forez, the Duke of Burgundy, the Duke of France, and the Counts of Flanders and Brittany, who exercised regal powers over their territory. To the king there remained only a few towns which he had not as yet been forced to give away as fiefs.

This rending of the state was continued even within the large fiefs. The dukes and counts were all as powerless as the king against the Northmen and Saracens, and the people whom the kings had failed to unite in common endeavour gradually fell into the habit of depending on themselves. After fleeing for long at the approach of the pagans into the woods among the fallow deer, a few stout-hearted men turned and refused to abandon all their possessions without trying to defend them. Here and there in mountain passes, at fording places in rivers, on the hill which overlooked the plain, entrenchments and ramparts were built which the brave and strong defended. According to an edict of 862, the counts and vassals of the king were ordered to repair the old castles and to build new ones. The country was soon covered with them, and the invaders constantly hurled themselves in vain against them. Some defeats served to temper their daring with prudence; they dared not venture so far into the midst of these fortresses which sprang up on all sides, and the new invasion, thus rendered hazardous and difficult, ceased in the following century. The lords of these castles were later the terror of the countryside, but they had in the first place been its saviours. Feudalism, so oppressive in its age of decadence, then served a useful purpose. All power was established by rightful use, but overthrown by abuse.

Power of the Church.—In the ninth century monarchy was in its decline, feudalism was advancing; one had lost its force, the other had yet to come to its full strength. The Church alone enjoyed its full strength, it lacked nothing; greater enlightenment and morality, the ardent faith of peoples, rich domains; in short, if the whole country should be divided and if civil and political society should crumble away, unity would still abide in the ecclesiastical body, as also the energy which animated it in

the fifty-six councils assembled in France during the thirty-four years' reign of Charles the Bald. The bishops, founding upon the right of the Church their claims of examining into the conduct of all men guilty of sin in order to reform or to punish, logically claimed that they might depose kings and dispose of crowns. Thus they were not only the ministers of religion ; in that age they shared in the administration of the state. From the time of Charlemagne, who had given them a share in the government of his empire, they were mixed up with all matters, and spoke everywhere with authority. It was they who put down and set up again Louis the Pious, who decided at Fontanet which was the side of justice. In 879, Charles the Bald, threatened with deposition by certain bishops because he violated the capitularies, could find no answer to this pretension, if only for the reason that, " consecrated and anointed with the sacred chrism, he may not be deposed nor supplanted until he has been heard and tried by the bishops who consecrated him king." Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims, the most eminent man of the period, haughtily claimed from him that right.

It was fortunate that the Church was so powerful in such a period, for, when all was yielded to the strongest, she reminded men that justice should reign over strength ; to the aristocratic principle of feudal organisation she opposed the principle of the brotherhood of men. In place of hereditary right and primogeniture, which prevailed in civil society, she herself adopted the elective idea and proclaimed the rights of intellect. If the prerogative of deposing kings, which she claimed, was a usurpation of civil authority, it must be remembered that the latter had no counterpoise but the power of the bishops, and the weak and oppressed had no other guarantee save the protection of churches.

Miscellaneous Facts.—Between 836 and 857 appeared the *False or Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, which were long regarded as genuine. They were extremely favourable to the authority of the papacy, greatly extending the right of appeals to Rome, with the result that they impaired episcopal authority. They reserved to the pope alone the power to judge bishops and established the immediate jurisdiction of the holy see over greater cases, " in favour of all the oppressed to whom the holy see owes the duty of succour, of all wrongfully condemned to whom it owes the duty of making restitution." Numerous councils

were held in this period in order to recover property which had been usurped from the Church. The Council of Troyes decided that the bodies of excommunicants should remain unburied. In 864, the Edict of Pistes forbade the slave trade, which indicates that though the majorty of slaves had already become serfs, the institution had not wholly disappeared; traces of slavery may be found as late as the thirteenth century. One article of this edict orders the destruction of castles, "because they have become the resort of robbers and because from them the peoples of the neighbourhood have suffered great vexations and pillage." None the less the number of castles increased.

FIFTH PERIOD—FEUDAL FRANCE

(887–1180)

CHAPTER XVI

THE LAST CAROLINGIANS AND THE DUKES OF FRANCE (887–987)

Weakness of the Monarchy.—Only three-quarters of a century had passed since the illustrious founder of the second empire of the West had been laid to rest in the vaults of his basilica at Aix-la-Chapelle, and already there had ceased to be either an empire or an emperor; even monarchy had signed its active abdication at Kiersy. The King of France was a mere figure-head, yet his useless title was for many years the object of much contention. The whole of the tenth century was taken up with the quarrel of the two houses who fought over the pitiful crown of the last descendants of Charlemagne; discords which proved doubly fatal, since they favoured the invasions of new barbarians and the progress of feudalism.

Election of Eudes, Duke of France (887–898).—After the deposition of Charles the Fat, Count Eudes was elected king. He had bravely defended Paris against the Northmen, and in recognition of his services had received from the emperor the duchy of France, or rather, Charles had confirmed him in possession of that large fief. He was the son of Robert the Strong, celebrated in the time of Charles the Bald for his services against the same enemies, and ancestor of all the Capetians. But the royalty of Eudes was only recognised by the nobles who dwelt between the Loire and the Meuse. Beyond the Meuse reigned Arnulf, King of Germany, who, in 895, created a kingdom in Lorraine for his son, Zwentibold; and south of the Loire, Rainulf, Duke of Aquitaine, assumed the title of king. At this time the kingdom of Provence was divided in two: Cisjurane Burgundy (Franche-Comté, Dauphiné, Provence), under Louis, son of King Boso, and Transjurane Burgundy (Switzerland as far as the Reuss, Le Valais, and part of Savoy), under Rudolf, son of a Count of Auxerre. Thus there were five kings in France. Presently a sixth arose, Charles the Simple; not to mention the

kings of Navarre, a state which was now entirely separate, and the kings of the Bretons, who were not likely to become more amenable now that she was ruled by an upstart than when a grandson of Charlemagne demanded obedience from them. Moreover, she suffered from the constant and terrible visitations of the Northmen, who never left her soil, and of the Saracens, who in 889 settled at Frejus, on the coast of Provence.

Success of Eudes against the Northmen.—Eudes skilfully contended with all these enemies. He took back neither Lorraine nor the two kingdoms of Burgundy, he neglected the Bretons who were at that time torn by civil war, ignored Navarre which was far off, and consented to recognise as a species of suzerain the Carolingian Arnulf, King of Germany, in whom imperial ambition survived in spite of the great protest of 887. But he forced the Duke of Aquitaine to renounce his title of king and to swear fealty to him, and gained two victories over the Northmen, one in the forest of Montfaucon in Argonne, the other near Montpensier in Limagne in 892. While it is impossible to place complete reliance upon the exaggerated accounts of these battles, which the poet Abbo has left us, there is no doubt that they were brilliant successes. But they produced no lasting results. The pagans were too thickly scattered over the country for the defeat of one of their bands to intimidate the others. At that very time they took and sacked Meaux, Troyes, Toul, Verdun, Evreux, and Saint-Lô. "The prophecy of the Lord," said the synod of Metz, "is coming to pass; strangers will ravage your land under your eyes, and will make of it an arid waste." Devastation, indeed, spread farther every day; food was an exorbitant price, cattle were scarce, and in many parts of the country there was no grain to sow the fields.

Rivalry of Eudes and of Charles the Simple (893).—To the evils caused by the new barbarians were shortly added those of civil war. The Count of Flanders refused allegiance to Eudes; another lord, kinsman to the king, took possession of Laon. Eudes recaptured the town and, to intimidate the factious, caused the rebel to be beheaded. He then found himself faced by another and more serious war. The partisans of the Carolingian dynasty set up a posthumous son of Louis the Stammerer who was surnamed, on account of his slow wits, Charles the Simple, and he was consecrated by the Archbishop of Reims (893). His supporters, the Duke of Burgundy and the Counts of Vermandois, Poitiers, and Auvergne, only sought in reality to bring about the ruin of the monarchy and to confirm themselves

in the positions which they had usurped. Eudes was supported by his numerous vassals of the duchy of France, and by those who had preferred a national king to that adventurous dynasty which troubled far less about saving France from the pagans than about seizing some Carolingian crown. Eudes presented himself before Reims with such forces that his opponent fled for refuge to Arnulf of Germany. The latter, forgetting his treaty with Eudes, ordered the counts and bishops of Lotharingia to restore to his hereditary kingdom this man who was of his own family. But the counts refused. Zwentibold, who had become their king in 895, involved them in a war which proved disastrous for him. He was forced to return to Lorraine, and Eudes put an end to that quarrel by granting several demesnes to his rival. This brave and energetic prince unfortunately died young, at the age of forty. His brother, Robert, inherited his duchy of France and Charles the Simple succeeded him as king without opposition.

Charles the Simple (898–992): Establishment of the Northmen in France (912).—Charles the Simple was celebrated for his misfortunes. In 912, he ceded to Rollo, a Northman chief, the province which took the name of Normandy, and which the new duke brought to a flourishing condition by his wise administration. This treaty, signed at St. Clair-sur-Epte, was fortunate since it put an end to the devastations which had lasted for a century. The new rulers of the country mixed with the old inhabitants, forgot their own language and ferocity, but still retained some of that spirit of adventure and love of gain which had led them to traverse so many countries and which enabled them to acquire first the south of Italy and, later, England.

Charles the Simple had promised to Rollo the hand of his daughter Gisela in marriage, on condition that he would renounce the worship of Odin. The new duke was baptised at Rouen, and his companions followed his example (912). He is credited with having systematically divided the country between them, and with having established in it such good order that having left one of his bracelets, as the story goes, among the branches of an oak on which he had rested while on a hunting expedition, that bracelet remained there for three years, no one daring to touch it. Blessed with peace and order, cultivation was revived in that rich province; personal slavery was early abolished, and, by a curious revolution, those who first spoke the best French were these Norman dukes, and it was in Normandy that the feudal system was most completely established,

the most flourishing monastic schools founded. There, moreover, originated that new art which was to raise such glorious monuments in Gothic architecture.

Elections of Robert, Duke of France, and Raoul, Duke of Burgundy (923–936).—In the year 912, when Charles lost a province he gained a kingdom. The Lotharingians submitted to him, but his weakness and his reliance on favourites angered the nobles. In 920, at the Assembly of Soissons, the lords declared that they would no longer obey the king if within the space of a year he did not reform his conduct and banish his minister, Hagano. At the same time, the Lotharingians deprived him of the crown which they had given to him. The warning was useless; but the nobles kept their word, and in 912 they crowned Robert, Duke of France. A battle took place near Soissons in the following year between the two princes; Charles was defeated, but his rival was killed. He gained nothing by that, for Raoul, Duke of Burgundy, the son-in-law of Robert, succeeded him. Thus dukes of France or Burgundy, the chiefs of the centre of ancient Gaul, aspired to retain the succession of the crown, and they succeeded in spite of the opposition of the lords of the north and south.

Germany, more faithful to the house of Charlemagne, rendered some assistance to Charles against his new adversary; but he failed to recover possession of his crown. Treacherously taken prisoner by Herbert, Count of Vermandois, he was confined in the castle of Peronne, where he died in 929. Raoul reigned for seven years longer without much distinction, despite two expeditions into Aquitaine and Provence from which he secured promises of fealty but nothing more. In 926, he repulsed an invasion of new barbarians, the Magyars or Hungarians, who emerged from the east as the Northmen had come from the north and west, and the Saracens from the south. The cession of Normandy to Rollo, and of Tours, Chartres, Blois, and Senlis to other chiefs, ended the ravages of the northern pirates. As for the Saracens, their devastations were chiefly confined to Provence. They maintained themselves there for eighty-four years. Their chief establishment was at Fraxinatum (La Garde-Freynet in Var), which was not taken from them until 973. The Hungarians, more numerous than the Saracens, fortunately appeared only at rare intervals in Lorraine, Burgundy, and even in Aquitaine. Germany took it upon herself to check them.

Louis IV. d'Outre-Mer (936–954).—On the death of Raoul, Hugh the Great, his brother-in-law and Duke of France, scorned

to become king, and recalled from England a son of Charles the Simple, Louis IV., surnamed d'Outre-Mer on account of this circumstance. The courage and activity of this prince were of no avail. He obtained the support of a few nobles who, jealous of the power of the Duke of France, had secured the duchy of Burgundy from his protégé. But when, in order to restore his demesne, he attempted to despoil the sons of the Count of Vermandois, and later the young heir of the Duke of Normandy, Hugh took up arms to check this unexpected flight of ambition, and Louis, defeated and taken prisoner, was retained in captivity for a whole year. Hugh did not release him from his confinement until the unfortunate king had ceded to him his only remaining town, that of Laon. Louis complained to the pope and the King of Germany, and a council excommunicated the Duke of France who, however, braved all threats, including a formidable invasion on the part of Otto the Great, the Duke of Normandy having allied himself with Hugh of France (946). Louis was reduced to the necessity of saying, in 948, at the Council of Ingelheim which was assembled by Otto: "If any one considers that my misfortunes have arisen from any fault of mine, I am ready to accept the sentence of the synod and of the king here present, or to repel the accusation by the judgment of God in single combat." No champion offered himself to represent the Duke of France. But this habit of appealing to a foreign prince, of which Charles the Simple had given an example, succeeded in rendering national, at any rate in the north of France, the opposition of the Capetian house to the last kings descended from Charlemagne.

Lothaire and Louis V. (954–987).—In 954, as the result of a hunting accident, Louis IV. ended "a life filled with anguish and tribulation" at the age of thirty-four. His brother-in-law, Hugh the Great, still did not desire this crown of France which he could so easily have secured, but gave it to his nephew Lothaire, the son of Louis. This prince certainly displayed some vigour. The attempt of Otto to restore the empire rallied round the King of France the great vassals of many districts who all aimed at preventing, either in France or Germany, the return of the old imperial power which would have lost to them all that they had won by usurpation since the time of Charlemagne. Lorraine was in this condition. The lords of that country called in Lothaire against Otto II. Hugh the Great was dead, but his son, Hugh Capet, was devoted to Lothaire, who had dearly bought fealty from the house of France by giving it Burgundy,

which it kept, and Aquitaine, which it was unable to secure. Lothaire penetrated to Aix-la-Chapelle where he received the submission of Lotharingia. Otto II., in his turn, made his way to Paris, ravaging the country. But his retreat was disastrous, and almost all his army perished on the banks of the Aisne. It was a great thing for Lothaire to have coped with so powerful a monarch; obliged to abandon upper Lorraine (890), he at least obtained for his brother Charles the duchy of lower Lorraine or Brabant. He died in 986. His son, Louis V., died in the following year as a result of a fall from his horse having done nothing which could go down to history, for which reason the old chroniclers gave him the surname of "fainéant." With him died the Carolingian dynasty in France.

The last descendants of Charlemagne had displayed more energy and activity than the last descendants of Clovis, and they deserved to come to a better end. The reason of their weakness was the great misery they suffered through the establishment of hereditary fiefs. It has been seen that they were reduced to the bare possession of the little town of Laon. Thus they had no means of rewarding services; neither lands, for they had no demesnes; nor money, for they levied no public taxes; nor offices, feudalism having taken everything. They were, therefore, gradually forsaken. In their isolation they sought external help; they became the friends of the foreigner. The invasions of the Germans in their favour accomplished the ruin of their cause, and prepared the peaceful accession of a new dynasty, more French, more national.

CHAPTER XVII

THE FIRST FOUR CAPETIANS (987–1108)

Hugh Capet founds the Third Dynasty (987–996).—Louis V. had an uncle, the Carolingian Charles, Duke of Lower Lorraine or Lothier (Brabant, Liége, etc.), and consequently a vassal of the King of Germany. But Hugh Capet, eldest son of Hugh the Great, the Duke of France, Count of Paris and Orleans, and, moreover, Abbot of St. Martin at Tours, of St. Denis, and St. Germain des Prés, that is to say, having the disposal of the revenues and influence of the three richest abbeys in France, decided at length to take the title of king which his father had scorned. He was brother to the Duke of Burgundy and brother-

in-law to the Duke of Normandy. These princes met the principal lords and bishops of France at Senlis, rejected Charles of Lorraine, whose close alliance with the Germans caused them to regard him as a foreigner, and proclaimed Hugh Capet, who was consecrated at Noyon. "The kingdom was not gained by hereditary right," said Adalbéro, Archbishop of Reims, "but by noble blood and by ability"; and he proposed the election of the man who had protected him against the threats of Lothaire, and who was only known as the *great duke*. Even in Lothaire's lifetime, just as Pope Zachary had condemned the ancient dynasty two and a half centuries earlier, Silvester II. said, "Lothaire is king in name, but Hugh is king in fact and by his deeds." And it was even believed that the saints themselves sided with the new dynasty; Hugh Capet built a chapel to St. Valery, the saint having appeared to him and said, "You and your descendants shall reign until the remotest posterity."

Absorption of a Great Fief in the Royal Demesne. — Hugh Capet founded a new house which for many centuries occupied several European thrones. But the name of king in the tenth century implied so little real power that the close of the Carolingian dynasty and the accession of the third royal race caused little sensation in the outlying provinces. They simply regarded it as the end of a secular conflict and of endless bickerings. It was, nevertheless, an event of importance. France broke definitely with Germany and the empire; moreover, the crown was thus annexed to a large fief. The king at least became, as Duke of France, Count of Paris, Orleans, etc., the equal of the most powerful nobles. Circumstances thus assisted him and he prosecuted the rights of his title.

As early as the first year of his reign, with a shrewdness which led to serious consequences, he caused his son to be consecrated king, and prevented the return of those electoral assemblies from which he had derived his royal position, but from which —had they been repeated as frequently as beyond the Rhine— anarchy such as was suffered in Germany for five or six centuries would have arisen in France.

Opposition to the New King.—The Assembly of Senlis was not attended by all the great nobles of France; the counts of Flanders, Vermandois, Troyes, and no doubt those of Poitiers and Toulouse, failed to appear. They declared themselves for Charles of Lorraine, but upheld his cause inadequately. Charles, defeated after a war which lasted two and a half years, was taken and confined in the town of Orleans, where he died the

following year. Hugh Capet was less fortunate in Aquitaine. He indeed conquered the Count of Poitiers, who payed him homage, but this prince was himself defeated by Adelbert, Count of Périgord, who advanced as far as the Loire to besiege Tours. Hugh ordered him to desist from this enterprise, and on the refusal of Adelbert to obey him, he sent a messenger with the following question : " Who made you count ? "—" Who made you king ? " answered the proud lord. Hugh Capet did not obstinately insist on the submission of these unmanageable Aquitainians ; he allowed them to recognise as king the son of his rival, Charles of Lorraine, or rather, to sign their charter with these words, *Deo regnante*, during the reign of God, until we have a king.

Forced Inaction of the First Capetians.—They were destined to wait for two centuries for this king, until the time of Philip Augustus, who at last restored to the monarchy a part of the rights and power which it had lost. During the first half of this period of two centuries there were kings, but they did not reign ; they possessed a title, dignity rather than any strength or power. The first three successors of Hugh Capet occupied the throne for a hundred and twelve years (996–1108), hardly leaving any record in history but their names.

It must, however, be remembered that the first Capetians were seriously handicapped. Since the conversion of fiefs into hereditary possessions had split up the territory, and the hereditary succession to offices had divided authority between many, there remained to the king neither enough material power nor enough influence to enable him to act beyond his own domains in any other way than as suzerain. In virtue of this suzerainty, he held together by feudal ties various provinces which would otherwise have parted asunder. Like other feudal lords, he lived on his domains ; he presided over his court of justice, plenary court, and parliament ; made the circuit of his towns, and spent his time of leisure in repeated acts of devotion, in long hunting expeditions in the forests which once more clothed the land, or in war against some neighbouring baron. In the rest of the kingdom each cared for himself. The nobles on their own estates made laws and waged war, judging and executing without any interference from the king. The last capitulary, that is to say, the last general law for the whole kingdom, dated from the time of Charles the Simple, and the oldest title deeds which have come down to us from the third dynasty are posterior to the year 1100. Moreover, they were merely private

charters until the reign of Philip Augustus. No document of general interest can be discovered prior to the year 1190.

Alliance of the First Capetians with the Church.—These princes followed the example of the first Carolingians and allied themselves with the Church. If the results of this alliance were not as brilliant as those secured by Pippin and Charlemagne, the Church at least consecrated and popularised their right. Until the days of Philip Augustus each king took care to have his eldest son consecrated in his lifetime. Hugh Capet never wore the crown, but he wore the cap of the Abbot of St. Martin of Tours, and gave back to the Church many abbeys which he possessed. Robert was a veritable saint; and in spite of a few acts of severity on the part of the pope, the princes of the new dynasty merited the surname, "the eldest sons of the Church," awarded them by grateful Rome.

Robert (996–1031): His Excommunication (998).—Hugh Capet died in 996 at the age of fifty-four. Robert, whom he had associated with him during his lifetime, began his reign amid universal terror. It was a belief that, according to a passage in the Apocalypse, the end of the world would occur in the year 1000. Accordingly donations to the Church were multiplied, piety increasing with fear. To the end of his life, Robert never forgot the impressions of the first years of his reign. He was a monk rather than a king, spending much time and energy in charity and singing hymns, but very little in producing order in the state, which, in point of fact, he was totally incapable of doing. But his peace was disturbed by an excommunication pronounced against him by the pope for having married Bertha, his kinswoman. In spite of his piety, Robert at first resisted the thunders of Rome. But the terror caused among the people by the pontifical sentence was so great, says a writer of the period, that all men fled at the approach of the king. There only remained with him two servants to prepare his food, and they purified by fire all the vessels which he had touched. Robert surrendered; he renounced Bertha and married Constance.

Queen Constance and the Aquitainians.—This imperious woman, whom the king himself came to fear, was daughter of the Count of Toulouse. She brought with her some troubadours who charmed all the courts of the south of France with their verses. But these Aquitainians, by their elegance, luxury, and easy morals, shocked the northern French, and a curious proof of the antipathy of the two races is found in the following

narrative of the writers of that period: "No sooner did Constance appear at court," says Raoul Glaber, "than France was overrun by the vainest and most hare-brained creatures that ever walked the earth. Their manner of living, their dress, their armour, and the harness of their horses were equally fantastic. Their hair hardly grew to the middle of their heads; they were veritable actors whose shaven chins, long stockings, ridiculous boots ending in a long point bent back, whose whole grotesque exterior bore witness to their lack of mental balance. Men without faith, without law, without shame, whose contagious example corrupted the French nation, formerly so modest, and dragged her into all kinds of debauchery and crime." In studying the crusade against the Albigenses, to understand something of the appalling character of that war, it is necessary to remember these old prejudices of the northern French against those of the south.

Constance, "who never jested," said Helgaud the monk in his touching history of Robert, "Constance was the scourge of the good king." He hid his alms-giving from her, and she incited to rebellion Hugh, her eldest son, who died in 1025, and later, Henry, her third son.

Importance Abroad of the Title of King of France: Acquisition of the Duchy of Burgundy (1016).—From afar the title of King of France was deceptive. During the preceding reign, Duke Borel, who commanded in the March of Spain, and who was threatened by the Saracens, had invoked the help of Hugh Capet, as formerly the emirs of Saragossa and Huesca implored that of Charlemagne. When the Italians wished, on the accession of Conrad I., to throw off the German yoke, they offered their crown to Robert. The nobles of Lorraine at the same time proposed to recognise him as their overlord. Robert, fearful of so great an honour, hastened to refuse. He was right as far as Italy was concerned, but wrong in the case of Lorraine. No doubt this refusal arose from a just appreciation of his weakness. This king, nevertheless, acquired the duchy of Burgundy after a five years' war (1016). The royal house was thus in possession of two of the great fiefs, the duchies of France and Burgundy. Unfortunately, Henry, who succeeded his father as king, was unable to keep the latter.

Persecution of the Jews (1010): First Heretics Burned (1022).—Notable events in the reign of this prince were an insurrection of the serfs of Normandy in 997, a cruel persecution of the Jews in retaliation for the destruction of the church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem by the Fatimite Khalif of Egypt, and the first

execution of heretics in France. Thirteen of these unfortunate people were burnt at Orleans (1022). One of them had been confessor to Queen Constance. As he passed near her on his way to the stake she put out one of his eyes with a small stick which she held in her hand. Other executions took place at Toulouse and elsewhere. Heresy raised the indignation of the faithful and the Church, but it testified to a certain mental activity. Even these digressions of the intellect from the beaten path proved that the country was no longer wholly devoid of the reasoning faculty. The eleventh century saw the beginning of the first *Renaissance*.

"Robert," said the chronicle of St. Denis, "departed to eternal life while copying the necrology of Melun." This town, which also witnessed the death of Philip I. and the birth of Philip Augustus, often served as residence to St. Louis, and was a second capital for the first Capetians.

Henry I. (1031–1060) : Foundation of the First Capetian House of Burgundy.—Henry I. was only the third son of Robert ; one of his elder brothers was dead, and the other, "being imbecile, was not made king." This time the Duke of Aquitaine assisted at the coronation. The Capetian house was taking root in the country. Henry was doomed to suffer from his mother's ambition. Constance wished the crown to pass to her fourth son, Robert, and Henry was only able to free himself from this rivalry by ceding Burgundy to his brother. This Robert was the ancestor of the first Capetian house of Burgundy, which lasted until the year 1361. Henry had next to disperse a rebellion formed by his other brother Eudes, whom he captured and imprisoned in the castle of Orleans (1041).

Indolence of Henry : His Marriage with a Russian Princess.—This reign of thirty years was devoid of events. "We saw," said a contemporary, "the inertia of Robert, we now see that of his son, the kinglet Henry, heir to his father's indolence." Indeed, excepting for a few expeditions into Normandy, for the most part disastrous, Henry I. accomplished nothing. In 1046, he refused the offer made to him by the Duke of Upper and Lower Lorraine to be recognised as suzerain, and allowed the Count of Flanders to transfer his homage to Germany.

The most remarkable act of this reign was the king's marriage with a daughter of the Grand Duke of Russia. Henry had chosen a princess of so remote a house in order to be quite sure that he would not find himself related to her within the degrees prohibited by the Church. Anne, they said, was descended by

her mother, the daughter of the Emperor Romanus II., from Philip of Macedon. Her first-born took the name of the father of Alexander.

The Dukes of Normandy: The Counts of Blois and Anjou.—If royalty did nothing, it was because the lords did much. Three of these especially filled France with the clamour of their ambition and with their wars.

Robert, surnamed "the Magnificent" by the nobles, and "the Devil" by the people, usurped the ducal crown of Normandy by poisoning his brother, Richard III., with his principal barons, at a banquet. By dint of energy and courage he crushed the opposition which his crime had excited, and as disputed master of Normandy he interfered with all his neighbours. He upheld King Henry against his brother, which gained for him in return the French Vexin. He attempted to deprive Canute the Great of the throne of England in favour of his cousins the sons of Ethelred, but his fleet, being driven by a storm from the shores of England to those of Brittany, he invaded that land and forced Duke Alan to pay him homage (1033). In 1035, seized with remorse, he sought rest for his conscience at Jerusalem. He died on his return journey in Asia Minor. There is still to be seen on one of the most beautiful sites of Normandy, overlooking Rouen, a hill bearing a few shapeless ruins. These are the remains of the castle of Robert the Devil, which, according to legend, was long haunted by evil spirits; it was not far from this spot that John Lackland is said to have stabbed his nephew.

The son and successor of Robert the Magnificent was the celebrated William the Bastard, who had great difficulty in obtaining the obedience of his vassals. The Battle of Val des Dunes, near Caen (1046), at last freed him from his adversaries. King Henry, his suzerain, had supported him against them, but soon finding the young duke too powerful, he allied with all his enemies. This was the cause of numerous conflicts between the Normans and the French (inhabitants of Ile de France), the latter generally assisted by the Angevins and Bretons. The most bloody among them was the Battle of Mortemar in 1054.

The king, upheld by the Count of Anjou, entered Normandy by the county of Evreux, while Eudes, his brother, entered the county of Caux with the cavalries of Picardy, Champagne, and Burgundy. Duke William was faced with two armies at this double invasion; those who marched against Eudes met the French who had disbanded to pillage near Mortemar. They killed some, captured others, and put the remainder to flight. Fleet

messengers brought these good tidings to the duke. "When darkness fell he sent one of his men who climbed a tree near the king's camp and began to cry with a loud voice. On being asked by the sentinels why he shrieked thus at such an hour, he answered: 'My name is Raoul de Ternois, and I bring you evil tidings. Take your waggons and your chariots to Mortemar to carry your friends who are dead, for the French came against us in order to test the Norman chivalry, and they found them stronger than they desired. Eudes, their standard-bearer, was shamefully put to flight, and Guy, Count of Ponthieu, was taken. All the others were killed or taken prisoner or, fleeing rapidly, had great difficulty in saving themselves. Carry this news at the earliest possible moment to the King of the French from the Duke of Normandy.'" The king, alarmed, retired in haste, and Geoffrey Martel was obliged to give up to William the suzerainty of Maine.

Eudes the second, Count of Blois, wished to seize the kingdom of Provence and then that of Lorraine; having restored Lotharingia, he aspired to reunite to it the crown of Italy. But a battle in the Barrois falsified the hopes of the turbulent baron; Eudes was defeated and killed (1037); his wife alone was able to recognise him amidst all the corpses with which the ground was strewn, and to pay the last honours to his remains.

A prince against whom Eudes often fought was still more renowned; this was Fulk Nerra or the Black, Count of Anjou, who made three pilgrimages to the Holy Land. During the last he caused himself to be dragged upon a hurdle through the streets of Jerusalem, naked and with a rope round his neck, flogged by two of his valets, and crying with a loud voice, "Lord, have pity on the traitor, Fulk the perjurer!" Then he undertook to return on foot, but was unable to go beyond Metz (1040). Fulk had indeed many crimes to expiate. Constance was his niece; having complained to him of one of her husband's favourites, Fulk forthwith sent twelve knights with orders to stab the favourite wherever he might be found. Of his two wives, he caused one to be burned, or, according to another story, he stabbed her himself after she had escaped death when thrown over a precipice by his orders; the other he forced by evil treatment to retire to Palestine. His son, Geoffrey Martel, was also a warrior. In 1036, he rose up in arms against his father in order to force him to give up to him the county of Anjou; but the aged Fulk defeated him and condemned him to the penalty of the *harnescar*. The rebel son was made to crawl

several miles with a saddle on his back to come to the feet of his father and implore his pardon. Geoffrey Martel, jealous of the power of the Duke of Normandy, allied with King Henry I. against him. His successors followed that policy and the kings of France found useful allies in the counts of Anjou against the Norman dukes who had become kings of England, until the very moment when these counts themselves inherited the British crown. It is said that the wife of Geoffrey Martel liked reading, but that such was then the scarcity of books that she was obliged to give two hundred sheep, five quarters of wheat, and the same quantity of rye and millet in order to obtain a manuscript containing homilies. The beautiful cathedral of Angers was begun under Fulk Nerra.

The Truce of God (1041).—To diminish the evils produced by continual private wars between the nobles, the Church put forward the following agreement, which it caused to be adopted by the majority of the princes: "From Wednesday evening to Monday morning in each week, on the great festivals, and throughout the whole of Advent and Lent it is forbidden to conduct warlike operations. This shall be the truce of God. He who infringes it will pay the penalty with his life or be banished from the country." This truce, although ill observed, was a great benefit to the people, who poured their blessings on the Church (1041).

Philip I. (1060–1108).—Philip I. was only seven years old at the time of his father's death, but King Henry had taken the precaution of having him consecrated at Reims during his lifetime. Moreover, this crown of the first Capetians was of so little importance that even though worn by a mere child no one was moved by a desire to seize it. The reign of Philip I. would have been still more devoid of deeds than that of his father had the nation been as torpid and indolent as its sovereign. This prince witnessed the subjection of southern Italy and Sicily by a few gentlemen of Coutances; the founding of the kingdom of Portugal by a Capetian of the house of Burgundy; the conquest of England by William the Bastard, Duke of Normandy; and finally, the rush of the whole of French chivalry to the crusade. He watched the accomplishment of these great deeds yet took no part in them. At last, jealous of his too powerful vassal the Duke of Normandy, he exhibited towards him, if not a highly dangerous enmity, yet a stubborn ill-will. He supported the Bretons against him and forced him to raise the siege of Dol (1075); he rendered assistance to his eldest son Robert, who had revolted against the new king, but this time

provoked a terrible war. "When will this fat man be delivered?" said he, jeering at William's corpulence. To which the Conqueror replied that he would be churched at Paris with ten thousand lances by way of tapers. He tried to keep his word. He entered the domains of the king and put everything to fire and sword. Mantes was taken and burned, including the churches where many people perished in the flames, and his skirmishers burned the villages even to the gates of Paris. Fortunately he fell ill at Mantes itself and died near Rouen.

The King of France maintained the same policy towards the successor of the Conqueror, but with the same weakness. He still supported Robert, Duke of Normandy, against William Rufus, who had usurped from his elder brother the crown of England, and sold to the latter his defection. He was well aware of the peril in which France stood, with a King of England as master, through Normandy, of the roads to Paris, but he had not the courage to make the necessary effort to plot against it.

His marriage with Bertrada, wife of the Duke of Anjou, exposed him to the further danger of excommunication with which he was visited by the Church, guardian of the moral laws. For ten years he took no notice of it. Under this indolent prince, the demesne, however, was increased by the addition of the French Vexin, the Gatinais, and the county of Bourges.

Miscellaneous Facts.—Under the Capetians, the national assemblies which Charlemagne had so often consulted, even the gatherings of lords and bishops common in the tenth century, fell into disuse through the very progress of feudalism and the ruin of central power. They did not reappear until the fourteenth century, when the king gained a decided ascendancy over the lords. The Benedictine order was reformed in 930, at Cluny, by St. Odo. In 974 came the reform of the monasteries in the province of Reims by Archbishop Adalbero. Hence the great movement of religious reform which Gregory VII. implanted in the following century over the whole of Europe originated in France. Gerbert, born in Auvergne, Archbishop of Reims and later of Ravenna, pope under the name of Silvester II., invented the pendulum clock and introduced Arabic figures into Europe.

CHAPTER XVIII

FRANCE IN THE ELEVENTH CENTURY—EXPOSITION OF THE FEUDAL SYSTEM

Three Distinct Societies.—There were in the sixth century three societies in Gaul, the Gallo-Romans, the barbarians, and the Church; in the eleventh there were also three, the lords, clergy, and serfs, each having its own customs and organisation and, up to a certain point, its peculiar language and literature; the two former were rich, powerful, and active, the latter oppressed and miserable.

1. Feudal Society: Fiefs and Vassals.—It has been seen that the Edict of Mersen in 847 allowed every free man to choose a lord; that the Edict of Kiersy decreed in 877 the hereditary succession of fiefs and royal offices. These edicts sanctioned a revolution begun long before, which it will be well to study more closely. It gave birth to an entirely new social order which, after having reigned supremely over Europe during several centuries, has not yet completely disappeared. In the very country where an organisation founded on other principles replaced feudalism, the Middle Ages handed down customs which proved to be stronger than the new laws. Modern nobility is an ever-living remnant of feudal times.

There had been, under the Merovingians, two principal kinds of properties: *allodial*, lands free from taxes and dues "owing relief only to the sun," as the ancient formulas express it; and *benefices*, lands charged with dues more or less numerous. He who received a *benefice* or fief was bound towards him from whom he had received it, either to personal service or to payment in kind, in exchange for which he could rely on the protection of the grantor. The most important of these obligations was that of military service.

Allodial Estates converted into Benefices: Commendation.—In the midst of a society given to all kinds of violence, the proprietors of allodial lands, free from any obligations but isolated and therefore living in greater danger, sought protection from the great and *commended* themselves to some powerful man in the neighbourhood. The commendation was the act by which a proprietor of allodial lands made a fictitious cession of his land to the protector whom he had chosen, to receive it again at his

hands not as an allodial estate, but as a benefice, with all the obligations of military service and payment in kind to which beneficiary property was bound. This practice became general. Charlemagne himself contributed to make it so by the obligation which he imposed on every free man of choosing for himself a lord and of remaining faithful to him. By this means he aimed at establishing his control over a society which preserved a taste for barbarous independence, and introducing order into it by giving it a hierarchy. But it so happened that whilst working for order he was working against his own power, or rather against the power of his successors, for he himself was unassailable. In order to safeguard the rights of imperial authority, he demanded a direct oath from free men. Louis the Pious took the same measure at the beginning of his reign ; at the end of it he found great difficulty in renewing it ; as for his sons, the idea did not even occur to them. At that period, free men had no connection with any lord except him on whom they were dependent ; they did not even know the name of royal authority, the effects of which they never felt.

As proprietors practised commendation, land, which is permanent, soon came to be of more importance than man, who passes away and dies. It was not so much that a weak man commended himself to a stronger, but that a small estate commended itself to a large domain, and certain formulae symbolised this new relation ; the estate in a sense placed itself in the power of a great proprietor in the shape of a clod of turf or the branch of a tree which the petty proprietor deposited with him. There lay the germ of feudal relations. Towards the end of the reign of Charles the Bald the revolution was accomplished ; the whole country was composed of benefices or fiefs, that is to say, all lands were dependent on other lands, every man on some other man. The former was the mediate fief held by a vassal ; the latter was the immediate fief held by a suzerain or lord.

Hereditary Possession of Benefices.—One day Charlemagne reproached his son Louis, King of Aquitaine, for not having tried to attach his subjects to him by presents and grants of land. "You only give them your blessing," he added slyly, jesting at the piety of his son, "yet even if they ask you for that, it is not enough." The King of Aquitaine answered that he had nothing left to give, because the *leudes* refused to give back the benefices which they had once received and had bequeathed to their heirs. Charlemagne answered that he ought not thus to allow royal domains to be usurped, but should wrest them from those

who had appropriated them. Nevertheless as a prudent sovereign and a good father of his family he did not wish to compromise the popularity of his son, and himself undertook a task which would have been dangerous for any one else ; he sent out agents in his name to evict all holders of benefices which were detained illegally. Therein lies the whole explanation of the revolution of that period. Obstacles which Charlemagne could break down were insurmountable for his feeble successors. In their reigns, the hereditary possession of benefices acquired the force of custom, became a right, and this right was legally recognised from the year 877.

Hereditary Right in Public Functions or Offices.—The same thing occurred with regard to public offices and the titles of duke, count, and so forth, to which were attached the exercise of an authority delegated by the prince. This authority was so extensive that Charlemagne conceived the idea of strengthening his own power by giving to his agents a wider measure of authority, a course in which he was followed by his successors. But with offices as with benefices, he never overlooked too independent action on the part of his counts. He constantly appears in his capitularies as checking their attempted encroachments, rebuking their neglect, and preventing them from forgetting that he was their master. To control them better, he never entrusted more than one county to the same individual. His successors forgot this wise and vigilant policy, which would indeed have been impossible for them. Money was scarce, and public taxation no longer existing, they were obliged to pay for all services with lands or benefices. When these benefices became hereditary, the kings only possessed a few demesnes which had escaped the greed of their vassals. Devoid of money, soldiers, and lands, they could not prevent their officials from making hereditary the posts which they held. Thus, the count secured hereditary control over what was his county, that is, he secured the right of exercising over a certain extent of territory the prerogatives of regal authority which had been assigned to him. The capitulary of Kiersy-sur-Oise confirmed this usurpation. A certain idea of the state of things then existent can be gathered by imagining what France would be if prefects, magistrates, and generals could not be deprived of their offices by the government which employs them, and if they had the right to hand down to their children or, if need be, to sell, by the same right as any other property may be sold, the authority entrusted to them by the state. There was yet this

difference that the authorities of France are divided, whereas in the ninth century they were united, the count being at once the political, military, and judicial head in his county.

This usurpation of royal right gave sovereign prerogatives to every great proprietor or lord; the right of waging war, of coining money, of making laws, of judging and of executing sentences. And since this usurpation occurred in every part of the administration, being practised by duke, count, viscount, and centenier, *feudalism*, which was the name given to that regime, introduced a hierarchy of proprietors whose political rights were proportionate to those with which they had originally been invested by the king. This partly explains how a hundred and fifty great tenants-in-chief exercised at the accession of Hugh Capet the regular right of coining money, how so many others might make war as they felt inclined, legislate, and judge; but it does not suffice to explain this transformation of public powers into demesne privileges over the whole extent of the country. It must be added that every great proprietor had already, from time immemorial, private jurisdiction over his slaves, servants, colonists, and tenants, and that seignorial justice was, as expressed by Montesquieu, an ancient incident of every great property and fief. The usurpation, therefore, did not consist in the fact that the lords possessed the right of administering justice, but in the fact that they judged without appeal.

There were few proprietors in the Middle Ages; but in those days the right of property was very much more strongly established than it is at the present day, since it then included what it no longer includes, political, legislative, and judicial authority. "In those days ownership and magistracy were one and the same thing." And that characterises this period so justly described as the Middle Ages. The feudal lord, at once proprietor and sovereign, illustrates the transition from the old master, who was absolute ruler over his slaves, to the modern landowner, who has merely farmers and servants whose relations with him are determined by free conventions.

Tenants-in-Chief.—The tenants-in-chief were those who did personal homage to the king, as, for instance, the Counts of Champagne and Flanders, the Dukes of Burgundy and Aquitaine, and so forth. They exercised regalian rights over their lands, administrating, judging, and waging war without any reference to the king, who had no real power but a mere title, unless this title went with the possession of some great fief, duchy, or

county. Therein lay the whole importance of the revolution which resulted in the substitution of the Capetian house for that of the Carolingians. In 987 the royal demesne was limited to the town of Laon; by the accession of Hugh Capet this demesne included the whole duchy of France, and the king became at least equal in power to his vassals, whilst formerly his real power was inferior to that of the feeblest among them.

Feudal Hierarchy.—The owners of fiefs formed a vast association, a hierarchy which ascended from the simple knight to the king, and in which each might possess at the same time the double character of suzerain and vassal. Thus, a count, the vassal of a duke or a king, was suzerain to many viscounts, barons, or knights. The King of France was himself a vassal of the Abbot of St. Denis in virtue of an estate which he held from that abbey; the Duke of Burgundy was vassal to the Bishop of Langres; and it is seen in an old charter that thirty-two knights banneret[1] owed homage and military service to the Viscount of Thouars, who himself owed both to the Count of Anjou, vassal to the King of France. But it must not be supposed that a count was always and everywhere superior to a viscount and subordinate to a duke. Hierarchical subordination only existed within each great fief, and the Count of Anjou had nothing in common with the Duke of Burgundy, except his title of vassal of the crown of France. In many great fiefs vassals even treated their suzerain as the nobles had treated the King of France. It was the expressly recognised right of the vassal to make war against his lord when it seemed good to him, withdrawing his homage on condition that he restored to him the fief, which he generally took care not to do. Lastly, a man might at the same time be vassal to two different suzerains, and be required to render military service to both at once.

Homage, Fealty, Investiture.—Feudal relationship was established by a ceremony in which three primary formalities had to be fulfilled. The grantee of an estate knelt before the grantor, placing his hand within the hand of his future lord, and declared that he became his *man*, that is to say, that he undertook to defend his life and earthly honour; then he took the oath of fealty. The following is the formula of liege homage: "The man must place his two hands together as a sign of humility, and place them within those of his lord in token of vowing everything to him, and must promise faith; and the lord then receives him and also promises to preserve faith and loyalty

[1] A knight made in the field.

towards him; the man must say the following words: 'Sire, I come into your homage, into all your faith, and become your man in word and deed, and swear and promise to you faith and loyalty, towards all and against all, and to defend your right to the best of my power.'" Then the lord in turn gave him the land by *investiture*, either by placing in his hands a clod of earth or a branch of a tree or, in the case of greater fiefs, a standard. "It was customary," said Otto of Freisingen, "for kingdoms to be delivered by the sword, provinces by the standard."

Suzerain and Vassal.—On the accomplishment of this triple ceremony, one became suzerain, the other vassal, and from that moment they were united by reciprocal rights and duties. The suzerain owed to his vassal justice and protection, and might not deprive him of his fief excepting in a case of forfeiture or treason.

Obligations of the Vassals.—The most important of all obligations imposed on the vassal was that of following his lord to war. The conditions on which vassals had received their fiefs determined for how many days, sixty, forty, thirty, or even less, they must render this service, and with how many armed followers. Some were only obliged to serve within the boundaries of the suzerain's territory, and for defence, not for attack. Abbots and women, who were exempt, furnished substitutes. Originally, whoever owed feudal service was accounted noble.

If the vassal was obliged to serve his lord in war, he was also obliged to help him with advice when required, and to attend his court of justice. Sharing thus in judgments, he undertook to execute with his own hand the sentence which his lips had pronounced.

There were also *feudal aids;* the vassal was obliged to assist his suzerain to pay his ransom, to provide for the first marriage of his eldest daughter, to knight his eldest son, and to equip him for a journey to the Holy Land.

These were not the only occasions on which the suzerain exacted useful subsidies from his vassals. At every change of ownership the lord had a right to a *relief*, which was payable by the inheritor of a fief on receiving investiture. It took the shape of a sum of money, or originally a draught horse, a charger, a saddle, arms, a pair of gilded spurs, or such like.

If a vassal sold his fief, a part of the purchase money, approximately equivalent to one year's revenue, belonged to the suzerain as the right of mutation.

A fief without an heir, or confiscated for some offence,

for infidelity or treason on the part of the vassal, reverted to the lord. Therein lay the wealth of those suzerain houses which had the good fortune to endure. A part of the dominions of the crown, under the third ruling race, was comprised of fiefs which, in default of heirs, had reverted to the royal demesne.

A vassal in his minority remained under the guardianship of his lord who received the profits of the estate until he attained his majority.

Daughters could only marry a man chosen by the suzerain, unless they paid a sum of money, sometimes a considerable sum.

There were moreover moral obligations. The vassal was bound to keep the secrets of his lord, reveal to him the schemes of his enemies, help him with advice, at all times to defend him and his honour, give up his charger to him in battle should he be unhorsed, or take his place in captivity; in short, to spare neither property nor person in saving him from all peril and all shame.

These obligations fulfilled, the vassal ruled almost absolutely over his fief, and could only lose it by forfeiture, that is to say, by not conforming to the conditions of the feudal contract.

It will be noticed that the feudal system in developing made of everything a fief. Every concession—the right of hunting in a forest, of fishing in a river, of safe conduct on the roads, of escorting merchants, of the manor bakehouse in a town, in short, all useful property—was only granted on conditions of faith and homage, thus becoming a fief. The lords multiplied concessions of this description in order to increase the number of men who owed them military service. But the fief itself, to which the rights of justice were attached, generally remained undivided and passed as a whole to the firstborn.

Relations between the Vassals: Peers: Trial by Battle: Right of Private War.—Vassals under one lord were peers or equals (pares); they comprised their lord's court of justice from which appeal was allowed to the court of *his* superior lord. The formalities were neither long nor difficult. If the parties could not agree, a judicial combat, or a duel in an enclosed field, decided the side of justice and truth. The vanquished was necessarily the guilty. It was the judgment of God. When one of the parties was a woman, a priest, a child, or an old man, he might be replaced by a champion, but still ran all the risks of the fight. The defeat of the champion meant the condemnation of the person whom he represented. This appearance before the court of the suzerain seemed all too long for the pugnacious

impatience of these men. For a wrong suffered, an injury received, they immediately took up arms. This was the right of private war. It was always conducted honourably; the enemy was warned beforehand.

All lords had not equal rights of jurisdiction. There was high, middle, and low justice, and certain nobles had only the last and second. These distinctions which did not always rest on the nature of the crimes, but sometimes on the rank of the accused, were only regularly determined at a later date. The right of high justice included the right of pronouncing death sentences, the sinister emblems of which were the pillory and gibbet raised close by the castle.

A Feudal Castle.—All political systems can, if necessary, be characterised by the place in which their power is exercised. The ancient republics had their *agora* and their *forum;* the great monarchy of Louis XIV. had its palace of Versailles, in which dwelt all that was then called France; feudal lords had their castles. They were generally enormous round or square structures situated on eminences in order to command a wide view, massive, devoid of architecture or ornament, and pierced only by a few loopholes from which arrows were shot. They consisted sometimes, as at Montlhéry, of five concentric circles, each overlooking the next. "The door," said a modern chronicler, who, by dint of much learning, had rendered himself almost a contemporary of those bygone ages, "the door, flanked with turrets and surmounted by a tall guardhouse, was entirely covered with heads of wild boars and of wolves. Through three enclosures, over three moats, and three drawbridges, the great courtyard was reached, in which were the cisterns, and on right and left, the stables, poultry-houses, dovecots, and coachhouses. The cellars, vaults, and prisons were underneath; overhead the bedrooms, storehouses, larders or salting-rooms, and armouries. The whole structure was surrounded with loopholes, parapets, paths along the top of the walls, and watch towers. In the midst of the courtyard was the donjon, in which the archives and treasure were secured. It was surrounded by a deep ditch and could only be entered by the bridge which was almost always raised; although the walls were, like those of the castle, over six feet in thickness, it was protected to half its height by a second wall of massive freestone.

"By being raised, the drawbridge covered the gate of the castle, which was further defended by the *portcullis*, a heavy iron grill sliding in grooves, which could be let down in time of need. At

the corners of the fortress great towers arose, ornamented with battlements which protected the defenders of the place against the darts shot from outside, and with *machecoulis*, a kind of parapet, the lower part of which was pierced with holes from which boiling water and blazing pitch could be poured over the assailants who reached the foot of the wall. The donjon was always built at the point most difficult of access, to hold and overlook the whole place, generally rising in the middle, as may still be seen at Vincennes ; sometimes it joined the ramparts as in the château of Coucy. Immense subterranean passages opened a way far out into the plain or forest."

The Troubadour and the Trouvère.—Men who lived in such an abode needed some way of escape from the sadness and boredom of those dark vaults into which bright sunlight never found its way. But it was impossible either to fight or to hunt perpetually. The pilgrim who journeyed from afar entered for a few moments to entertain the inhabitants of the manor by pious stories and news of distant lands. But what was accounted truly good fortune was the arrival of a bard, known in the north as *trouvère*, in the south as troubadour, who, seated at the hearth of the lord, chanted to him through long evenings of the tragic adventure of the lady of Fayel and the Sieur de Coucy, or of the marvellous exploits of the knights of the Holy Grail and of the Round Table, of Renaud and Roland, of Charlemagne and his twelve peers ; unless, as a relief, in the humour for merry-making, he was asked for some mocking tale in verse describing the tricks played on Master Isengrin by his crafty companion Master Renard :—

> "Car ils ôtent le noir penser,
> Deuil et ennui font oublier."

Tournaments.—There were also, however, games and festivals ; but the games and festivals in practice among that warlike society were challenges and combats, often mortal, jousts and tournaments. Geoffrey de Preully, lord of Vendomois, who died in 1066, was, as it were, their law-giver. Only courtesy weapons, of blunted steel with neither points nor sharp edges, were brought to the tournaments ; but in combats *to the death* ordinary arms were used. The judges or stewards of tournaments caused the knights to swear that they would fight honourably ; and, after having measured the lances and swords and made sure that neither of the antagonists was fastened to his horse's saddle, they gave the signal for the conflict. The combatants charged each other ; if their lances broke

against the shields or the steel armour, they struck each other with sword or battle-axe until one of them fell vanquished. He who did not observe the laws of combat, who struck any other part of the body than that between the arms and legs, or who dealt more blows than the judges had decreed, lost his weapons and his horse. Generally the helmet and the sword of the vanquished belonged to the victor. The prize awarded by the judges to the best striker was a tournament sword ; to him who had best defended himself they gave a helmet. The prizes were often awarded by ladies. These festivals always attracted a great concourse of princes, lords, and knights, but some of them were invariably carried from the lists dying or dead.

Arms.—Until the reign of Charlemagne, arms had been mostly offensive ; in the Middle Ages, they were chiefly defensive. From the eleventh to the fourteenth century, knights wore a coat of mail or *hauberk*, which covered the warrior from head to foot and was proof against the sword, but not against the lance. To protect himself from the latter, he wore a short coat thickly padded, the *gambeson* or *hoqueton*, or a slab of iron next to the skin, known as a *plate*. The *helmet*, of thin steel, entirely covered the head, only having narrow slits to allow of breathing and seeing, and was called *visor* or *ventail*. The helmet was only worn by knights, but all soldiers wore the iron cap fastened to the hauberk by a network of several thicknesses of iron links. The *shield* or *buckler* also acted as defensive armour. Offensive weapons were the *sword*, *lance*, *battle-axe*, *club*, and *dagger of mercy*. The infantry only had the *coutil* or knife and the bow or *arbalist* brought over from Asia in the twelfth century.

2. Religious Society: Ecclesiastical Feudalism.—The clergy themselves entered into the system of feudalism. The bishop, formerly *defender of the city*, often became its count by traditional usurpation or by special grant from kings who had united, as at Reims and many other towns, the county and bishopric, political and spiritual authority, which rendered the bishop suzerain of all the lords in his diocese. Over and above its tithes, the Church possessed, thanks to donations from the faithful, enormous wealth. To protect it from the robberies of those times the secular arm was called in to assist. Laymen were chosen, men of courage and ability to whom the domains were entrusted that they might, if need be, defend them with the sword. But these *advocates* of monasteries and churches did like the king's counts ; they rendered their offices hereditary and appropriated the

goods which had been entrusted to them. But they consented to acknowledge themselves vassals of those whom they despoiled, to render them faith and homage under the ordinary conditions of payment in kind and personal service. Abbots and bishops thus became suzerains, temporal lords, having under them numerous vassals ready to arm themselves in their cause, a court of justice, and, in short, all the prerogatives exercised by the great proprietors. Thus appeared duke-counts and bishops, themselves vassals of other lords, and generally of the king, from whom they received the investiture of goods attached to their church, or, as it was described, their *temporalities*. This ecclesiastical feudalism was so numerous and powerful that in France and England it possessed in the Middle Ages more than one-fifth of the land, in Germany nearly one-third. For there was this difference between the Church and the king, that the latter, having achieved the conquest, received nothing more, while he was obliged constantly to make gifts, with the result that he eventually possessed only the town of Laon; whereas the Church, if she lost some estates (an improbable occurrence, because she could defend her possessions by the power of excommunication), made constant acquisitions, there being few of the faithful who died without leaving her something, as a result of which she was constantly receiving and never or rarely giving, losing only that which was seized from her by violence.

Ecclesiastical Literature.—It has been seen how the empire of the Franks was broken up on leaving the hands of Charlemagne. The same must be said of civilisation, of which the elements had been collected and brought together by his care. He was not unaware of the fact that unity of ideas is the indispensable cementer of political unity; and besides, like all great men, he longed to reign over a civilised empire rather than over barbarians. Hence those letters and capitularies in which he decrees "that schools shall be founded and attended not only by sons of serfs, but by those of free man," that is to say, not only by the children of poor country people to whom the warriors left with scorn the humble and peaceful office of clerk or monk, but those very boys who should one day succeed the warriors and carry into battle the great sword of their fathers. Such orders led to nothing less than the formation of an enlightened lay society which would have transformed the Middle Ages. But on the death of Charlemagne this nobility at school flung far from them their Latin and Teutonic grammar books, and saw with joy the

prospect of civil wars in which each might follow his own bent and all could be won by courage.

Hincmar and John Scotus Erigena.—But ecclesiastical society preserved something of the impetus given to study by Charlemagne. Under the vast edifice, crumbling in all directions but not yet overthrown, the ninth century shielded an intellectual development which was not without a certain grandeur. Hincmar replaced Alcuin, and Charles the Bald attempted to imitate Charlemagne. In 855, the law and a council strongly recommended the study of divine and secular literature; in 859 there were fresh attempts to restore the Carolingian schools, "because this interruption of studies brings ignorance of faith and dearth of all knowledge." In 882 occurs the first mention of the episcopal school of Paris, which later enjoyed so great a reputation, and in the catalogue of the library of St. Riquier for the year 831 mention is made of two hundred and fifty-six volumes, among which figure the *Eclogues* of Virgil and the *Rhetoric* of Cicero, Terence, Macrobius, and, perhaps, Trogus Pompeius, which has since been lost. There was even a movement of philosophical ideas and disputes which presaged those of the great periods of the Middle Ages. Gotheschalk the monk believed he found in the writings of St. Augustine the dogma of predestination. Defeated by Raban Maur, the wise Bishop of Mainz, a disciple of Alcuin, and condemned by two councils, Gotheschalk was confined by Hincmar in the depth of a cloister to the end of his days without having consented to recant. The celebrated John Scotus Erigena (an Irishman), charged by Hincmar to reply to him, also provoked repression by what he called his purely human and philosophical method of reasoning, a method which was in fact based upon the study of an ancient philosophy.

Further Decadence at the End of the Ninth Century and Second Renaissance of the Eleventh Century.—Political confusion became greater; the ruin of the empire was accomplished; the nobles struggled, fought, and despoiled, creating disorder at will. Amidst all this violence there was no place for intellectual activity. It could be found nowhere save in some isolated monastery, the only asylum where, in the tenth century, the last pale lights of learning lay hid to avoid the raging of the tempest. Outside, black darkness reigned; appalling misery, physical and moral, pestilence, and famine; it seemed that physical death was to take possession of the world, that intellectual death had already almost conquered it; it believed itself about to perish. On the approach of the year 1000, there was no

more building, no more repairing, no more provision for the future at least for the future here below ; men gave the clergy their lands and houses *mundi fine appropinquante*.

But this hour of anguish and unspeakable terror passed like all others. The sun rose as usual on the first day of the year 1000. Suspended life again followed its course with renewed energy. The world thanked the God who had suffered it to live by a great wave of Christian unity and religious heroism which was expressed by the chief of the Christians: "Soldiers of Christ!" cried Silvester II., the first French pope (999–1003), pointing to sacked Jerusalem, "Soldiers of Christ, arise! We must fight for Him!" Before the century had drawn to a close, millions of men had responded to this appeal.

In the meantime every one set to work ; the earth seemed to have thrown off its old age and to be clothed in a white splendour of new churches. Basilicas were rebuilt, monasteries founded. In eight centuries, only 1108 had been built in France ; 326 rose in the eleventh century, 702 in the twelfth. This animation occurred also in the spiritual world. Silvester II. set the example; this simple monk of Aurillac, under the name of Gerbert, went to the Mussulmans of Spain to study letters, algebra, and astronomy and opened out to Christian Europe a new source of knowledge, Arabic science ; he collected a considerable library, constructed globes, and invented the pendulum clock, a marvel which won for him the reputation in the eyes of the vulgar of being a magician sold to the devil.

The second Renaissance took place chiefly in France, and especially in that province of Normandy where the warlike spirit of feudalism had been at its highest. There was the magnificent abbey of Fontenelle or St. Wandrille, restored by the duke in 1035; that of Jumiéges, the imposing ruins of which still stand ; that of Bec, founded in 1040, which was rendered illustrious from the very beginning by the presence of the two great doctors, Lanfranc and St. Anselm ; not to mention the monasteries of Caen, Rouen, Avranches, Bayeux, Fécamp, and Mont St. Michael "in Peril of the Sea." William the Bastard was surnamed the Conqueror but also the Great Builder.

In the heart of these monasteries, the monks were no longer content to copy rare manuscripts which had survived the wreck of ancient civilisation. They were interested in the events which took place around them, and recorded them, or they were anxious to strengthen their faith by theological discussions which once more assumed a learned character. Richer, a pupil of Silvester II.,

doctor as well as monk, wrote in the abbey of St. Remi a history of the tenth century, in which he imitated Sallust as Einhard imitated Suetonius. Abbo, monk of St. Germain, chanted in somewhat clumsy verse the exploits of Count Eudes and of the Parisians against the Northmen whose history another William wrote in the abbey of Jumiéges.

Lanfranc and St. Anselm: Berengar and Roscelin —Whilst some wrote, others taught and pupils flocked to learn. At St. Stephen of Caen, the Italian Lanfranc had an audience of more than four thousand hearers. In vain did he attempt to escape the illustrious destiny which pursued him in the solitude of Bec. It placed him in spite of himself in the archiepiscopal chair of Canterbury. This awakening activity of the mind some times diverged from the beaten path. Mention has been made of the heresy which caused thirteen miserable men to be led to the stake in 1022. Another, stirred up by Berengar of Tours, disturbed the Church for more than thirty years (1050–1080). Berengar, like John Scotus Erigena, saw in the Eucharist only a memorial service, and submitted the things of faith to the test of reason. "You must resign yourself not to understand," said his friend the Bishop of Liége to him, "for can you ever understand the great mystery of God?" But Berengar wished to analyse his belief, and audaciously brought his reason to bear on all mysteries. He was one of the forerunners of Luther, although the latter knew nothing of his writings. Lanfranc was his chief adversary.

St. Anselm, an Italian like Lanfranc, succeeded him in the abbey of Bec and in the see of Canterbury. He revived dogmatic theology, which had been almost abandoned since the days of St. Augustine, that is to say, for about six centuries. He embraced with absolute faith the whole of Christian dogma, and employed, to demonstrate its truth, all the force of his powerful mind, all the resources of dialectic and the art of reasoning. He sometimes argued as closely as Descartes. The famous proof of the existence of God given by the father of modern philosophy—that the mere fact of thought proves the existence of a supreme Being—is only a reproduction of one of the arguments of St. Anselm.

St. Anselm, like Lanfranc, was obliged to cope with bold innovators who, making use of dialectic, that dangerous ally of theology, shook the dogmas by wishing to subject them to the rules of reason following the logical system of Aristotle. Berengar had attempted to interpret the mystery of the Euchar-

ist, Roscelin attacked about 1085 that of the Trinity, and dawning scholasticism began with the quarrels of the *realists* and *nominalists*, subtlé discussions which rendered barren so many laborious efforts.

Art in the Church.—The Church was then not only the guardian of faith but also of knowledge. She had her doctors; she also trained and directed architects, painters, and sculptors. There was little building in the tenth century; in the eleventh, when all fear was allayed after the fatal epoch of the year 1000, the peoples, as if in an outburst of gratitude, worked throughout Christendom at the reconstruction of cathedrals; from that moment may be dated the first epoch of the grand architecture of the Middle Ages, the Roman period. Then the more graceful semicircle replaced the heavy Roman arch, the thick pillars of old Carolingian churches became suddenly lighter in build, the flat vaults became bolder, the naves of churches less dark, the towers less square. Air and light entered into the buildings as they rose towards heaven; *masters of living works* began to lend life to the stone; already the pointed arch was making its appearance, only in vaults, it is true, and not yet well proportioned owing to its solidity.

Three churches may be used as examples of this progress. That of Orcival in Auvergne, built at the end of the tenth century or the beginning of the eleventh, had already some measure of elegance, but lacked height and ornamentation; it possessed no principal doorway and only two entrances at the sides; as yet far from the true pointed style. The cathedral of Angoulême, of 1120, still affected the perpendicular and horizontal lines of the old system of architecture. Its front, rectangular and sparing of ornament, shows only the plain semicircle; the pointed arch is just visible in the nave. But Notre-Dame of Poitiers, of the same century, is one of the masterpieces of Roman architecture. Bas-reliefs, arches, statues, and varied ornamentation are multiplied with profusion on its rich façade which surmounts a rather prominent triangular pediment, already foreshadowing the pyramid style which was to reign in the following century.

3. The Serfs.—In the eleventh century France was covered with a multitude of fiefs, each of which formed a state having its own separate existence, its laws, its customs, its own lay or ecclesiastical chief; this noble had not only vassals, he had also subjects resident on that portion of his land which he had not enfeoffed. First of all there were the *serfs*, the *men of the land*, who were entirely surrendered to his discretion. "The overlord,"

said Beaumanoir, "may deprive them of all they possess, and may confine them in prison whenever it may please him, whether justly or unjustly, and he is only held responsible to God."

Mainmortables.—Above them came the *mainmortables*, "those treated with more consideration," continued the old jurist of Beauvais, "for the overlord may demand nothing from them if they do no evil, except their money payments, their rents and the dues which they are accustomed to pay in commutation of their services." But the *mainmortable* might not marry without his overlord's consent; if he took to wife a free woman or one born outside the seigneury, "it is meet that he make a fine at the will of his overlord." That was the right of *formariage*. The children were equally divided between the two overlords. If there was only one he would belong to the mother's overlord. On the death of *mainmortables* all their possessions passed to the overlord. For them there was no way of escape from the hard hand which bent them to the plough. They only possessed the right of making suit which attached to their person and property. The overlord was the universal heir of his serf.

Vilains.—One degree higher in the scale were the free tenants called *vilains*, *manants*, or *routuriers*. Their condition was less precarious. They had kept their liberty which the serf did not possess, and held, on condition of paying an annual rent and *boon-work*, the manor lands which the proprietor had granted to them, and which they could make over with all their personal property to their children. But while the beneficiary tenures or fiefs were under the guarantee of a distinctly fixed and clearly determined law, manorial tenures were under the absolute jurisdiction of the proprietor and only guaranteed by local conventions. As a result, the *vilains*, especially those in rural districts who had not to be conciliated like those in the large towns, were themselves subjected to an authority which was generally unlimited. The following was written of the lords in an ancient document: "They are lords of sky and earth and they possess jurisdiction on and below the earth . . . over neck and head, over water, winds, and woods." The *vilain* was not able to seek judgment, for feudal law said: "Between you, lord, and you, *vilain*, there is no judge but God." "We recognise as the property of our gracious lord," said another formula, "the right of banishment and summons; the tall forest, the birds of the air, the fishes in running water, the wild beasts in the bush, as long as our gracious lord, or the servant of his grace,

pursues them. So that our gracious lord may take under his protection and support the widow and orphan as also the man of the land." Thus every right was abandoned to the lord, but in exchange he was bound to defend the weak. Such was the principle of feudal society in respect of those subject to it. Royalty no longer filled the office for which it was created; the protection which was not forthcoming from the nominal head of the state was demanded from bishops, counts, barons, and every powerful man.

Obligations of Subjects.—Everything belonged to the overlord; but as neither industry nor commerce existed, nor that luxury which allows one man to consume in a few moments the fruit of the toil of many, the exactions of the lord were not at first oppressive; as for the *vilains*, their rights were as finally fixed as the rights of a landowner with regard to his farmers are fixed to-day. In considering the Middle Ages, allowance must always be made for the part played by arbitrary power and by violence which, of course, the law did not recognise. The obligations of the *vilains* were then either payments in kind—provisions, wheat, cattle, poultry, the products of the land and farm—or physical labour, such as work on the land or in the vineyards of the lord, the building of his castle, the maintenance of moats, the mending of roads, and the making of furniture and utensils, horseshoes, ploughshares, carriages, and such like. In the towns, and wherever there was wealth, it is obvious that the lord would not hesitate to exact money dues and to impose arbitrary taxes. But in course of time such exactions were gradually abandoned; at an early date the Church declared, "The lord who takes unjust dues from his *vilain* does so at the peril of his soul"; if lords were not restrained by fear of damnation, that fear was soon reinforced by the rise of the communes and by the energetic intervention of royal authority.

There were also bizarre dues to enliven the dull life of the feudal lord, secluded all the year round within the gloomy walls of his manor. In Bologna and Italy, a tenant of the Benedictines of St. Procula payed, as his customary due, the smoke of a boiled capon. Every year he brought his capon to the abbey between two dishes, uncovered it, and when all the steam had disappeared, was allowed to depart, taking his capon back with him. Elsewhere the peasants solemnly led a little bird to the noble on a carriage drawn by four horses; or sometimes a may tree decorated with ribbons. The owner of a monkey paid his dues

according to an ordinance of St. Louis, by allowing his monkey to play before the lord's toll-gatherer; the *jongleur* merely sang a song. The lords themselves sometimes consented to take part in these popular comedies. The Margrave of Julich, on his solemn entry, was made to ride on a one-eyed horse, with a wooden saddle, a bridle of lime bark, two spurs of hawthorn, and a white staff. When the Abbot of Figeac made his entry into the town, the lord of Montbrun received him grotesquely dressed and with one leg bare.

Feudalism, weary of itself, sometimes jested with the poor; so did the Church when she authorised the celebration in her cathedrals of the festival of the Ass. The powerful and the fortunate, in those harsh and gloomy days when misery reigned everywhere and security was unknown, owed to their *vilains* and their peasants some moments of forgetfulness and mirth.

Anarchy and Violence.—The Middle Ages were indeed a harsh time for the poor when, in spite of all formulas and all conventions, the nobles only believed in the right of the sword. In theory the principles of feudal relationship were excellent, in reality they led to anarchy, for judiciary institutions were too defective to prevent the constant breaking of the bond of vassalage. In this fact is to be found the origin of those interminable wars which broke out in all parts of France, and were the great affliction of that period. It was possible for any man to draw his sword to avenge a proved wrong or a sentence which he considered unjust, a state of war was the normal condition of that society. Every hill became a fortress, every plain a battlefield. The feudal lords lived cantoned in strong castles, clothed in steel armour, surrounded with soldiers; tyrants, as monk Richer described them, who only loved battles and knew not how to enrich themselves except by pillage. Commerce was at a standstill, for the roads were unsafe; industry ceased, for the lords, masters also of the towns, levied contributions from the burghers as soon as they showed the least sign of opulence. Everywhere the customs were different, since there was no general legislation, each noble having the sole legislative power over his fief; everywhere also the most profound ignorance reigned, excepting in the heart of a few monasteries, and the clergy, guardians of moral laws, unable to prohibit violence, were reduced to the necessity of regulating it by establishing the Truce of God, which forbade killing and stealing from Wednesday evening to Monday morning.

Appalling Misery: A Famine of the Eleventh Century.—These feudal wars were not very murderous for the steel-clad noble, but they were terribly so for the peasant who fought almost without defensive armour. At Brenville, where the two kings of France and England fought, nine hundred knights were engaged; only three remained on the field. At Bouvines, Philip Augustus fell from his horse and for some time remained defenceless in the hands of the enemy's infantry; they vainly sought a flaw in his armour so that they might thrust a dagger into it, but the weapons which sought to pierce his cuirass were shivered into splinters against it. The knights were able at leisure to deliver him and to place him once more in the saddle, after which he rushed with them into the midst of this rabble, among whom the long lances and heavy battle-axes did not strike one blow in vain. The capture of the lord was a further affliction for the poor; a ransom had to be paid. No one paid for the burning cottage and harvest of the unfortunate poor, no one dressed their wounds, no one provided for their widows and orphans.

Two contemporary authors of the crusades described that disastrous period: "Before the Christians started for the lands beyond the sea," said Gilbert of Nogent, "the kingdom of France was a prey to perpetual disturbance and hostility. The chief subject for conversation was the robberies committed on public roads. Arson was common, and war, arising from no cause save insatiable greed, raged everywhere. In short, rapacious men respected the property of no one and indulged in pillage with unbridled audacity." And William, Archbishop of Tyre, says, "There was no security for property; if a man was suspected of being rich it was sufficient reason for throwing him into prison, holding him in bonds and subjecting him to cruel tortures. Brigands armed with swords infested the roads, laid ambushes, and spared neither strangers nor those who were consecrated to God. Even towns and strongholds were not immune from these calamities; hired assassins rendered their streets and open places dangerous to the wayfarers."

Raoul Glaber, the chronicler, describes in the following manner a famine which raged in the year 1033, and of which he was an eye-witness: "Continual rains had flooded the earth, the harvest was lost, and old and young were obliged to feed on beasts and birds. This source having been exhausted, hunger did not become less insistent, and after having tried to satisfy it with the bark of trees or the grass in the streams, they were reduced to devouring corpses. The traveller attacked, succumbed under the

blows of his assailants; his limbs were torn apart, grilled over a fire, and devoured. Others fleeing the country and thinking to escape the famine, received hospitality on the road, and their hosts slaughtered them in the night to provide food for themselves. Some offered children an egg or an apple to entice them away, and then sacrificed them to their hunger. Corpses were unearthed in many places to be eaten at these gruesome feasts. One miserable wretch even carried human flesh to the market to sell it cooked. Arrested, he did not attempt to deny his crime, and was strangled and thrown into the flames. Another dug up that flesh which had been buried, ate it, and was also burned."

"Three miles from Mâcon, in the forest of Chatenay, there is an isolated church consecrated to St. John. A scoundrel had built himself a hut not far from there where he murdered all the passers by. The monster then fed on their corpses. A man came to him one day to beg hospitality for himself and his wife, and rested for a few moments; glancing into the corners of the hut, he saw the heads of men, women, and children. At once he became frightened, he grew pale and tried to leave the place. But his host barred his way. The fear of death doubled the strength of the traveller; he escaped with his wife and ran in haste to the town to tell Prince Otto and the inhabitants of this awful discovery. A number of men were at once sent to verify the statement, and found this wild beast in his lair on their arrival with forty-eight heads of men whom he had murdered, whose flesh he had eaten. He was taken to the town, tied to a beam in a cellar, then cast into a fire. We ourselves were present at the execution."

"In the same province a trial was made of a form of food not known elsewhere. Many people mixed a kind of white earth similar to potter's clay with what remained to them of grain and flour, and out of this they made loaves to satisfy their cruel hunger. It was the only hope which remained to them of escaping death, and it did not meet with any great success. The faces of all were pale and emaciated, their skin strained and swollen, their voices shrill and calling to mind the plaintive cry of dying birds. The great number of deaths made interment impossible, and the wolves, long attracted by the smell of corpses, came and devoured their prey. As individual graves could not be provided for the dead owing to their number, God-fearing men dug deep ditches known as charnel houses, in which they buried five hundred bodies, sometimes more if there was

room. They lay there mingled pell-mell, half naked, often indeed totally devoid of clothing. The cross-roads and ditches in the fields also served as cemeteries."

This ghastly tale from an eye-witness shows what suffering was caused by the absence of commerce and administration in the Middle Ages. To-day, the spirit of order and forethought knows so well how to provide against such scourges that they have caused on the whole little misery in those places where they have occurred, and what is still better, they do not disturb public morality. In former days, nothing could guard against the vagaries of the seasons. Every poor harvest brought a dearth, every dearth a famine, crimes, and atrocities. Out of seventy years, from 970–1040, there were forty-eight years of famine or epidemic.

Favourable Characteristics of Mediaeval Civilisation.—But the general progress of civilisation can never be so entirely suspended as to render the passing of three centuries totally unfruitful for mankind. It has already been seen that thought was reawakened in the Church, that poetry appeared in secular society. Some progress was made even with regard to morality, at least among the ruling class. In the seclusion in which every one lived, exposed to all manner of perils, the soul of man acquired renewed strength to face them. The conception of the dignity of man, which had been destroyed by despotism, revived; that society which shed blood with such deplorable ease often displayed a moral greatness peculiar to the age. The lower vices, the cowardice of the Romans or of a servile race during the period of their decline, were unknown to that society; it has handed down to modern times the sentiment of honour. The feudal nobility knew how to die; that is the first step towards knowing how to live.

Another good result was the reorganisation of family life. In ancient cities, the man lived outside his house in the fields or the market-place; he hardly knew his wife and children, yet possessed the right of life and death over them. At an earlier date, the custom of polygamy and the facility of obtaining divorces had prevented the family from establishing itself upon any firm basis. In feudal society, when men lived in isolation, the father was drawn nearer to his wife and children. When he had leisure from fighting, in the heart of some castle, perched on the mountain like an eagle's nest, there was nothing to fill his life and heart but the mother of his children. The Church that had caused these rough soldiers to bow at the feet of a

Virgin, who taught them to respect in the Mother of the Saviour all womanly virtues, softened the fierce tempers of these warriors and prepared them to fall under the charm of a more refined spirit and the more delicate sentiments with which nature has endowed the feminine sex. The wife then took her place in the family, and in society that rank already assigned to her by Mosaic law. She even went further; she became the object of a cult which created new sentiments, of which the poems of troubadours and trouvères took possession and which were practised by chivalry. Thus, in the beautiful legend of St. Christopher, the strong was conquered by the weak, the giant by the child.

An institution of that period illustrates this fact. Robert d'Arbrissel founded near Saumur, at Fontevrault, about the year 1100, an abbey which was soon destined to become celebrated and which united recluses of both sexes. The women were cloistered and prayed, while the men laboured in the fields, drained the swamps, cleared the sandy wastes, and remained the perpetual servants of the women. The abbey was governed by an abbess, "because," said the bull of confirmation, "Jesus Christ, dying, gave to his mother as son the well-beloved disciple."

Outside family life, the state was no doubt badly organised. Attention must be drawn, in spite of facts to the contrary, to the political theory which this society represented. If the serf had no rights, the vassal had, and they were very extensive. Feudal ties were only contracted on conditions well known and accepted by him beforehand; new conditions could not be imposed upon him except with his consent. Thus originated those great and strong maxims of public law, which, despite many violations, have come down to modern times; no tax could be exacted without the consent of the tax-payers; no law was valid unless accepted by those who were called upon to obey it; no sentence was legitimate unless pronounced by the peers of the accused. It was the principles of feudal society which the States-Generals of 1780 discovered under the debris of absolute monarchy; and, as guarantee for these rights, the vassal had power to break the tie of vassaldom by returning his fief, or to reply by war to a denial of justice on the part of his superior lord. This right of armed resistance, recognised by St. Louis himself, conduced, it is true, to anarchy; it weakened society, but greatly strengthened the individual. And from this point progress must begin. Before attempting to establish a stable constitution for

the state, it was essential to secure the liberty of the individual and the household. This double task was the work of the Middle Ages.

The Church laboured with zeal to establish the sanctity of marriage, even for the serf. She preached the equality of all men before God, which was a threat against the great inequalities of the earth ; she proclaimed, by the principle of election which she herself preserved even in the foremost positions in her hierarchy, the rights of intellect, as opposed to the feudal world which only recognised the rights of blood ; and, finally, she crowned with the triple crown and seated on the chair of St. Peter, from which he might place his foot on the heads of kings, a serf in Adrian IV. or the son of a poor carpenter in Gregory VII.

CHAPTER XIX

FOREIGN ENTERPRISES DURING THE SECOND HALF OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY

The Pilgrimages.—The eleventh century was a period of most ardent religious fervour among the nations. They had lately escaped from the terror caused by the approach of the year 1000 when the end of the world was expected ; and the peoples, glad to be alive, proved their gratitude by an increase of devotion. " At this time," says Raoul Glaber, the chronicler, one of the pious and brilliant spirits of the period, " new cathedrals arose on all sides, the Christian nations seeming to rival each other in their magnificence. The whole world appeared to have shaken off the rags of antiquity to clothe itself with a white robe of churches." Everywhere piety discovered relics of forgotten saints, and monasteries were raised over their tombs. On the announcement of some pious discovery, crowds flocked to the place from neighbouring provinces. They came from afar, for salvation seemed to await them at the end of their journey. Little by little they were emboldened to go still farther afield, to St. Martin of Tours on the Loire, to St. James of Compostella in Galicia, to Monte Cassino in Italy, to the tombs of the holy apostles at Rome. From there to Jerusalem they had only the sea to cross. It was perilous, but faith did not count perils. The monk Glaber declares that, from the time of King Henry, " an innumerable crowd came from the ends of the earth to visit the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem. First the lower classes

of the people, then the middle classes, then the counts, margraves, and prelates, and finally, what had never been seen before, a number of women, noble and poor, undertook this pilgrimage; many evinced the most ardent longing to die at Jerusalem rather than return to their own country." Fulk Nerra, Count of Anjou, visited it three times, the last occasion being in 1039. Robert the Magnificent, Duke of Normandy, also made this pilgrimage, and died at Nicaea (1035). The counts of Barcelona, Flanders, and Verdun undertook and accomplished the journey. In 1054, the Bishop of Cambrai went with 3000 Flemings; in 1067 four German bishops with 7000 men.

Reform in the Church by Gregory VII., who reawakens Religious Enthusiasm.—Thus the progress of the world, having remained at a standstill for two centuries through the influence of feudalism, once more advanced when Gregory VII. gave it fresh impetus, stirring up the Church and, through her, lay society. In the eleventh century the Church was too wealthy. Many of her members forgot that their lot should be that of the poor and assumed the habits of feudal lords. Discipline was relaxed and manners corrupted. The law of celibacy was no longer strictly observed and ecclesiastical offices threatened to become hereditary, as those of the state had done. They were usurped by the nobles. "The sanctuaries," said a writer of the period, "no longer ring with the chanting of psalms and praises of God, but with the clash of arms and the baying of hounds."

Hildebrand, for many years a monk at Cluny, in France, became pope in 1073 under the name of Gregory VII., and by his energy averted this danger from the Church. Through him the clergy were once more inspired with the virtues of abstinence and sacrifice; and this regenerated Church he attempted to place above temporal power. In order to bring her once more under the sole authority of the holy see, he wished none of her offices to be in the gift of laymen, but that all privileges should come from the pope; so that in according spiritual consecration to the bishop, the pope would at the same time be investing him with the lands dependent on his church. This gave rise to the Investiture Controversy, which specially affected Italy and Germany. Gregory VII. failed in this part of his great enterprise. Defeated and a fugitive, he gave utterance to these bitter words: "I have loved justice and hated iniquity, therefore I die in exile." But his influence did not die. Through him the holy see had awakened to a new life, the Church to a wider influence over the nations and over the affairs of the age. To Gregory VII.

she owed the power of accomplishing one of the most important events of the Middle Ages, that of converting the pilgrimages into crusades.

Conquest of Southern Italy by the Normans (1040–1130).—At first there were particular crusades, military expeditions undertaken under the auspices of the holy see to avert from it a danger or to re-establish its unrecognised authority. Thus Norman pilgrims, arriving at Rome towards the year 1016, were employed by the pope against the Greeks who were attacking Benevento. Others, returning from Jerusalem, assisted the inhabitants of Salerno to drive off the Saracens by whom they were besieged. The rumour of their success, and especially of the booty which they secured, attracted other Normans; they came in such force that they were strong enough to remain masters of the country. Pope Leo IX., beginning to repent of having secured such valiant neighbours, marched against them with an army of Germans. He was taken prisoner. But they remembered that the pontiff was a disposer of crowns, and that he could give the right to him who only possessed might. They knelt before their prisoner, declaring themselves his vassals, and received from him in fief all that they had conquered (1053). The pope came forth from captivity as suzerain of a new state. This was the duchy of Apulia, to which the Normans presently added Sicily; the two districts were united in 1130 under the name of the kingdom of the Two Sicilies; and a Norman dynasty, having for its chiefs Robert and Roger Guiscard, the sons of Tancred of Hauteville, a gentleman of Coutances, reigned at Naples, where the counts of Anjou also wore the crown and where the house of Bourbon later ruled supreme.

Conquest of England by the Normans (1066).—At the same time, another Norman dynasty took possession of the throne of England. The great island of Britain, conquered in the fifth century by the Angles and Saxons, was once more overcome in the eleventh by the Danes. The latter were unable to retain it for long. Edward the Confessor, a descendant of the former kings of the country, recovered the crown in 1042; but he prepared the way for the success of a new invasion by the favour which he showed to the Normans, among whom he had lived during his exile. He brought over a great number to his court, distributed the principal offices among them, and placed great confidence in his brother-in-law, Eustace, Count of Boulogne. When William II., Duke of Normandy, bastard son of Duke Robert the Devil, came to pay a visit to the Anglo-Saxon king,

he saw Normans everywhere ; at the head of troops, in the fortresses, in the bishoprics. It seemed to him that the conquest of England was half accomplished, and he returned thinking that it would be an easy matter for him to exchange his ducal coronet for that royal crown. But the Saxons had been disgusted with the ostentatious splendour which William had displayed, and with the favour shown him by the Normans, who had received him in regal state. They forced Edward to dismiss his friends from across the Channel and Harold the Saxon obtained all influence at court and throughout the country.

According to the traditional accounts of this period, Edward had formerly delivered hostages to William ; he ordered Harold to reclaim them. The duke welcomed him with all honour. One day, as they were riding together, the Norman said, " When Edward and I lived as two brothers, he promised me that if he became King of England he would make me his heir. Harold, if you help me to that, I will heap benefits upon you ; promise that you will give up to me the castle of Dover and, meantime, leave me one of the hostages." Harold promised vaguely, not daring to refuse a man who held him in his power. Arrived at Bayeux, in the presence of his court, William invited him to swear upon two small reliquaries that he would fulfil his promise. Harold swore. It seemed to him that an oath taken over two little reliquaries was not an oath of great importance. But William had deceived him ; there was, underneath, a large chest full of bones. When this was revealed to Harold he turned pale ; he feared to perjure himself over the bodies of all the saints.

His return was followed by the death of Edward. The Witenagemot, or great national council, gave him the crown. Immediately, William sent to remind him of his promise, " sworn over good and holy reliquaries." Harold replied that, extracted from him by force, it was invalid, and that, moreover, his kingship belonged to the Saxon people. William accused the Saxon of usurpation and sacrilege, and appealed to the court of Rome. Hildebrand, who was directing it, and who complained that Peter's Pence, a tax imposed on the Saxons by one of their former kings in favour of the Roman Church, had not been paid, caused Harold to be excommunicated and William to be given the kingdom of England. The pope sent him a consecrated banner, symbol of military investiture, with a ring containing a hair of St. Peter, enclosed under a diamond, emblem of ecclesiastical investiture. The duke then published his declaration of

war throughout France. Adventurers flocked to his standard, and on September 27, 1066, a considerable army embarked from St. Valery-sur-Somme in 1400 ships.

It landed at Pevensey, in the county of Sussex. Harold, who had just repelled a Norwegian invasion on the coast of Yorkshire, hurried to the spot. But he was defeated and killed at the Battle of Hastings (1066), after a valiant stand. Fair Edith of the Swan Neck was alone able to recognise the body of the last Saxon king. Saxon nationality fell with him. William divided the country between his followers, reserving for himself the best part, 1462 manors and the principal towns. Thus, men who on the continent had been valets or serfs, found themselves soldiers and gentlemen, possessing serfs and vassals, castles and seignoiries. The despoiled Saxon race long cursed their new masters, the French.

The French had, indeed, conquered the country; their civilisation, their customs, their language, their feudal institutions were to be implanted in England. Among the English nobility are still to be found French names, and the French language remained until the time of Edward III., that is to say, until the middle of the fourteenth century, the language of the court and tribunals.

But France paid dearly for this victory achieved by her arms, customs, and language. The dukes of Normandy, as kings of England, were possessed of power which long held that of the kings of France in check. Two centuries of war, eight of jealous enmity between the two peoples, such were the results for the French of that great achievement.

Conquest of Portugal by a French Prince (1094).—The infidels occupied Sicily and Jerusalem; they were still nearer and more threatening in Spain. The French knights lost no time in crossing the Pyrenees in order to assist the Christians of that country. In 1086, after the disastrous Battle of Zallaca, Alphonso VI. wrote to the King of France imploring his help. The indolent monarch did not answer this appeal to his honour; but a number of knights crossed the mountains and assisted the King of Castille to throw the Arabs back on Andalusia. Among these pious volunteers, arrived, towards the end of the eleventh century, two princes, Raymond, Count of Toulouse, and Henry, fourth son of the Capetian Duke of Burgundy. They both fought under the standard of Alphonso, King of Castille. They rendered him brilliant service, for Alphonso gave them his two daughters in marriage. With the hand of Thareja, Henry received a territory

which then extended from the Minho to the Mondego (1094). It was a small kingdom; he determined to enlarge it at the expense of the infidels and won over them seventeen victories, gloriously founding the independence of Portugal. His descendants reigned there until the twentieth century, but early forgot the origin of their nation. She, however, owes them a remembrance, for they carried her name with honour to the Far West. Others, at the same time, carried it to the heart of Asia.

CHAPTER XX

THE FIRST CRUSADE (1095–1099)

Peter the Hermit and the Council of Clermont (1095).—Alexus Comnenus, the Byzantine Emperor, threatened by the Seljukian Turks who were encamped before Constantinople, on the opposite bank of the Bosphorus, caused all Christian courts to re-echo with his cries of distress. But the dangers of this last broken remnant of the Roman Empire had no power to rouse the western Christians from their indifference. Already Silvester II., the first French pope, had written an eloquent letter to the princes in the name of forsaken Jerusalem in vain. Gregory VII., always inspired by great ideas, wished to place himself at the head of 50,000 knights to deliver the Holy Sepulchre. Emperors and popes alike failed to accomplish anything; a poor monk achieved the task which they had been unable to perform.

Jerusalem had fallen into the hands of a wild horde of Turks, and instead of the toleration which the pilgrims had received at the hands of the khalifs of Bagdad and Cairo, they were now overwhelmed with outrages, and it was only at great risk that any one approached the Holy Places. Peter the Hermit spread throughout France the sad story of these calamities, and the people, suddenly inspired with pious enthusiasm, armed on all sides in order to wrest the tomb of Christ from the hands of the infidels. The Council of Clermont assembled in 1095 and, presided over by a French pope, Urban II., preached the crusade. The number of those who, in that year and the following, assumed the cross of red linen, sign of their engagement in the holy enterprise, rose to over a million. The Church placed them under the protection of the Truce of God and granted many privileges for their property while the expedition lasted.

Departure of the First Crusaders (1096).—Men came from the

most remote countries: "Men were seen embarking at the French ports," said Gilbert of Nogent, "who, unable to make themselves understood, placed their fingers together in the shape of a cross to show that they wished to take part in the Holy War." The poor were the most impatient; trusting in God alone, they were the first to start without preparation, almost without arms, to the cry of *God wills it*. Women, children, and old men accompanied their husbands, fathers, and sons, and the little ones, placed on bullock carts, were heard to cry on seeing a castle or town, "Is not that Jerusalem?" An advance guard of 15,000 men, who, between them, had only eighteen horses, began the expedition under the command of Walter the Pennyless, a poor Norman knight. Peter the Hermit followed with 100,000 men. Another force brought up the rear led by the German priest, Gottschalck. They passed through Germany, slaughtering the Jews whom they met on their way, pillaging everywhere to secure food, and becoming accustomed to a life of licence. In Hungary the disturbances reached such a pitch that the population armed and hurled the crusaders into Thrace after having killed many of them. Only a small number reached Constantinople. The Emperor Alexis, to free himself of such auxiliaries, hastened their passage to Asia. They all fell under the sword of the Turks in the plain of Nicaea, and later their bones served to fortify the camp of the later crusaders.

Departure of the Great Army of Crusaders (1095).—While this foolhardy advance guard were meeting their death, the knights were arming, numbering themselves, and organising. They finally set out, 100,000 horsemen, it is said, and 600,000 infantry, by different routes and under different leaders. The northern French and the Lorrainers marched by way of Germany and Hungary. With them were Godfrey, Duke of Bouillon and of lower Lorraine, the bravest, strongest, and most pious of crusaders, and his two brothers, Eustace of Boulogne and Baldwin.

The southern French, under the rich and powerful Count of Toulouse, crossed the Alps and reached Thrace by way of Dalmatia and Slavonia; Adhemar, Bishop of Puy, adviser of the holy see and spiritual commander of the crusade, was in this army. The Duke of Normandy, the Counts of Blois, of Flanders, and of Vermandois joined the Normans of Italy, Bohemond, Prince of Tarantum, and his cousin Tancred, who was, after Godfrey, the most perfect knight of that time; together they traversed the Adriatic, Greece, and Macedonia.

The Crusaders at Constantinople (1097).—Constantinople was the general rendezvous. The emperor trembled lest the crusaders should wish to begin the crusade by taking possession of that great city. A few, indeed, thought of doing so in order to put an end to the perfidy "of these little Greeks, the most cowardly of mankind." But Godfrey of Bouillon opposed this idea. He even consented to pay homage beforehand to the Emperor Alexis for all the lands of which he took possession. "When he had done so, no one dared to refuse. As they took the oath, one of them, a count of high nobility, had the audacity to sit on the imperial throne. The emperor said nothing, knowing the presumption of the Franks; Count Baldwin, however, forced him to withdraw, telling him that it was not the custom to sit thus by the side of emperors. The other answered nothing, but glared angrily at the emperor, cursing and saying in his own tongue, "Behold that clown who is seated while so many brave captains remain standing." The emperor had these words explained to him, and when the counts had retired, took this haughty man apart and asked him who he was. "I am a Frank," said he, "and one of the noblest among them. In my town there stands at three cross roads an old church where any man who wishes to fight prays to God while waiting for his enemy. I have waited in vain, no one has dared to appear." The fears of Alexis were not removed until he had seen the last of these rough warriors cross to Asia.

Journey across Asia Minor: Battle of Dorylaeum (1097).—The first town which they reached was Nicaea; after two battles and thirty-five days of siege, they were about to take it, when they saw, flying from the walls, the Greek standard. To cross Asia Minor by the shortest route they became involved in the deserts which fill the centre of the peninsula and underwent terrible sufferings. The light Turkish cavalry of the Sultan of Iconium constantly hovered round them, cutting off the stragglers and the sick, and allowing none to disperse in search of food, forage, or water. When the sultan believed them to be weakened and discouraged, he came with an immense cavalry force to challenge them in the plain of Dorylaeum, in Phrygia, north-east of Iconium. The battle was for some time uncertain; the Turks had already inflicted many losses, when the arrival of Godfrey of Bouillon and a large force of knights put them to flight.

The Crusaders at Antioch (1098).—After fresh sufferings incurred in crossing the Taurus and in descending into Syria, they

arrived on October 18, 1097, before the great town of Antioch, which was defended by a lofty wall flanked with 450 towers and by a garrison of 20,000 men. The estimated number of the crusaders did not exceed 300,000. For seven months they remained before the place and would have waited there still longer had not Bohemond bribed an emir, who surrendered three towers to him. During a stormy night, when the noise of the wind and thunder deafened the sentinels, the Christians scaled the walls on rope ladders thrown to them from the place, and rushed into the city to the cries of *God wills it!* Ten thousand persons were slaughtered. Before allowing the Christian army to enter the town, the Norman required the other princes to agree that Antioch should be his portion of the booty. The crusaders made up for their long privations by indulging in excesses which decimated them, and they found themselves besieged in their own conquest by an innumerable multitude of Turks, commanded by Kerboga, lieutenant of the Khalif of Bagdad. Soon pestilence and famine raged in the city; many crusaders, despairing of ever reaching Jerusalem, left the army to return to Europe. Others remained, upheld by their courage; their faith saved them. Peter Bartholomew, a priest of Marseilles, declared to the commander-in-chief that St. Andrew had revealed to him, while asleep, that the lance which pierced the side of Christ was under the high altar of the church, and that it would give victory to the Christians. They dug and found the lance; the crusaders were filled with enthusiasm; they attacked Kerboga and cut his army to pieces.

Capture of Jerusalem (1099).—Instead of making their way at once to Jerusalem, they wasted another six months in Antioch, where they were consumed by plague. When at last they started, they were hardly 50,000 strong; a certain number, it is true, had remained in different towns through which the crusade had passed. They skirted the shores of the Mediterranean in order to keep in communication with the fleets of Genoa and Pisa, which supplied them with provisions. Enthusiasm increased as they drew near the Holy City and travelled through places consecrated by Gospel memories. At length, when they had climbed the last hill, their eyes beheld Jerusalem. "Oh, dear Jesus," said a monk who was in the army, "when the Christians saw the Holy City, how their eyes filled with tears! Loud cries of 'Jerusalem! Jerusalem! God wills it! God wills it!' rent the air. They spread out their arms, fell down on their knees, and kissed the ground."

It remained, however, to capture this city, the object of so many longings. It was defended by the soldiers of the Fatimite Khalif of Cairo, who had recently taken it from the Turks. This khalif, while the Christians were still at Antioch, had offered to allow them to enter Jerusalem but without arms. The offer had been contemptuously rejected; they intended that the Holy City should be their conquest and the price of their blood. They still suffered greatly under her walls. The sun of an Asiatic summer scorched the ground; the brook Cedron was dried up, the cisterns filled up or poisoned by the enemy; only a few pools of fetid water could be found, from which even the horses recoiled. To re-establish the *morale* of the army, a solemn procession passed round the town; on the Mount of Olives all the crusaders paused and prostrated themselves. On July 14, 1099, at daybreak, a general assault was made. Three great movable towers approached the walls; but after the first day's fighting nothing was accomplished. It was not until the next day that the crusaders finally captured the town. Tancred and Godfrey were the first to enter it. They were still obliged to fight in the streets and to force the Mosque of Omar, which was held by the Mussulmans. Rivers of blood flowed. "Beside the mosque," says a chronicler, "it reached the horses' bellies." When the fight was over, the chiefs and all the people laid down their arms, changed the clothes, washed their hands and naked feet, and singing hymns and sacred songs with ardent devotion, visited the Holy Places.

Foundation of a Latin Kingdom in Palestine (1099).—To keep their conquest it was necessary to organise it and to give it a chief. No king had taken part in the first crusade. Hugh of Vermandois, brother to the King of France, and Stephen of Blois, nephew to the King of England, had returned to Europe; Bohemond already had his principality of Antioch and Baldwin that of Edessa. The ambition of the Count of Toulouse was directed towards the throne of Jerusalem. Godfrey of Bouillon was preferred and was proclaimed king. He only consented, however, to take the title of *Defender and Baron of the Holy Sepulchre*, refusing "to wear a crown of gold where the King of Kings had worn a crown of thorns." The victory of Ascalon which he won shortly afterwards over an Egyptian army which advanced to recapture Jerusalem assured the conquest of the crusaders. Mussulman poets sighed: "How much blood has been shed! What disasters have visited the true believers! The women have been obliged to fly, hiding their faces. The

children have fallen under the sword of the victors! There is no other refuge for our fathers, formerly masters of Syria, than the backs of their swift camels and the entrails of vultures!" Islam, indeed, expiated her ancient conquests. But already the Christians wearied of so many hardships; almost all the lords were anxious to return to their own homes; hardly three hundred knights remained with Godfrey and Tancred. "Never forget," they always said with tears to those who went, "never forget your brothers whom you leave in exile." But the enthusiasm of Europe was chilled since from so vast an expedition so few had returned. Fifty years elapsed before a new crusade was undertaken for the relief of the Christians of Palestine.

Organisation of the Kingdom of Jerusalem: its Reverses.—Thus left to itself, this little kingdom was organised for defence and systematically regulated according to feudal principles which were transported bodily to Asia. The laws, language, and customs of France were preserved in the colony which she so boldly founded across the seas. Its code was the *Assizes of Jerusalem*, which Godfrey of Bouillon caused to be drawn up, and where a complete picture of the feudal regime can be found such as cannot be discovered in any other great legislative enactment. Fiefs were established; to the principalities of Edessa and Antioch were added the county of Tripoli and the marquisate of Tyre, the lordships of Nablous, Jaffa, Ramleh, and Tiberias; curious mixture of Biblical names and feudal institutions, which illustrates the real character of the Middle Ages—the intimate union between religious faith and military life.

The Part taken by France in the Crusades.—This great movement, which continued for more than a century and a half and which involved all the peoples of Europe, found its origin in France. "Men wept in Italy," says Voltaire; "they armed in France." And France was what the great English poet is compelled to call her, "the true soldier of God." Indeed, the French conducted the first crusade almost alone. They shared the second with the Germans (1147), the third with the English (1190), and the fourth with the Venetians (1203). The fifth (1217) and the sixth (1228) were of no importance. The seventh (1248) and the eighth (1270) were exclusively French. Moreover, the historian of the crusades gave to his book the title of *Gesta Dei per Francos*. Even to-day, in the East, all Christians, whatever tongue they may speak, have but one name, that of Franks.

General Results of the Crusades.—Thus, in the eleventh cen-

tury, the French began anew the Gallic invasions, crossed the Pyrenees, as did the Celtiberians of old; the Channel, as did the Belgians and the Kimri; the Alps, as did the Umbrians and the Insubres; and the Rhine, as did those Gauls who braved Alexander, threatened Delphi, and caused Asia to tremble. There was, indeed, at a distance of fifteen centuries, the same external impulse for expansion on all the frontiers. But if in both ages the same hardihood appears, the men of the later age had other ideas and attained to a far higher point of moral excellence. In England, in Naples, the French sought plunder only; but in Spain and in the East they fought and died for their faith. One of the grandest spectacles ever witnessed was this rush of millions of men to win a tomb. Very few returned; and those who succeeded these first pilgrims were able to follow their track by the bones with which the road was strewn. But civilisation is like a stronghold, the first who fall die nobly, and others cross the ditch filled with their corpses; only history collects the glorious names and consecrates their memory by associating with them that unknown crowd who thronged behind the chiefs.

The crusades did not attain their end. Jerusalem, delivered for a time, fell back into the hands of the infidels. But what changes took place in the very countries from which the crusades started and in the minds of those men and their contemporaries! Formerly they lived apart and as enemies; the crusades made an end of isolation and obliterated divisions. In this perilous journey across remote countries and amongst peoples of another creed, the crusaders acknowledged themselves brothers in Jesus Christ. In the division of the immense army into national bodies, men of the same country recognised each other as children of the same fatherland. The northern French drew nearer to the southern French; national brotherhood, lost since the days of Rome, scarcely realised for a moment under Charlemagne, was regained on the road to Jerusalem; and troubadours and trouvères began to sing, at least for the barons and knights, "the sweet country of France."

At Clermont, Urban II. had not preached the crusade merely for the deliverance of the Holy Sepulchre, but had in view also the removal of the scourge of private war. All Christendom paused in contemplation, "then there fell a great silence," said Gilbert of Nogent. A silence of arms and evil passions, which unfortunately did not last, yet gave some respite to the world and favoured the expansion of two new powers, the monarchy and the communes, both of which desired the public peace.

Effect on Commerce and Industry.—These great expeditions, which renewed the broken ties of Christian nations and joined Europe to Asia, also opened for commerce the roads which had been closed since the Saracen invasion. The Orient once more became accessible to the merchants of the West. Industry also awakened to furnish arms, harness, and necessary apparel to so many men; this movement, once begun, never died out. Mechanics and merchants multiplied. To protect their various industries they formed *corporations* of arts and crafts, and gradually vast sums of money accumulated in their hands. A new and hitherto unexpected source of influence was discovered during this period. The importance of personal property developed at the expense of that of real property, and by the labour of their hands and the exercise of their intelligence the bourgeoisie, masters of the world's gold, were enabled to take their place beside the nobles, the masters of the soil.

Creation of Military Orders: Arsenals.—The crusades were the cause of some new institutions. Gerard de Martigues, a Provençal, founded in 1100 the *military order of Hospitallers*, later known under the name of knights of Rhodes and knights of Malta. The *Order of the Templars*, instituted in 1118 by Francis Hugh de Payen, was an imitation of it. In the confusion caused by these great gatherings of men, signs of recognition were necessary. *Armorial bearings* were invented or multiplied. They were various emblems with which warriors of distinction decorated their shields, coats-of-arms, or banners, and which, from the thirteenth century, passed from father to son. These armorial bearings became a complicated language which formed the science of *heraldry*. Family names also began to be introduced about that period. Up to that time baptismal names were alone used, and as they were few in number, many individuals bore the same. Now the name of the estate was added in order to distinguish family from family. This name was hereditary and common to all members of one house, while the baptismal name was personal and died with the person who bore it.

Development of Knighthood: Laws of that Institution.—The nobles, already distinguished from the *manants* by these hereditary signs, wished to establish for themselves an organisation which would separate them still more from the people. They instituted the order of knighthood, a species of military brotherhood into which those of noble blood alone might enter after long tests. The *orders* of modern Europe are a last relic of them. "From the age of seven years, the future knight was taken away

from women and entrusted to some valiant baron who set him the example of knightly virtues. Until the age of fourteen, he accompanied the lord and lady of the manor as *page, varlet, damoiseau, or damoisel.* He wielded the lance and sword, hardened himself to the most violent exercise, and, by this incessant activity, prepared himself for the fatigues of war, and acquired the necessary physical strength to wear the heavy armour of the period. The example of a lord who was presented as a model of chivalry, the exploits of love and war which were described to him during long winter evenings in the hall, in which was hung the armour of knights and which was filled with memories of them; sometimes also the songs of a troubadour who paid for the hospitality of the lord by some poem in honour of the paladins of Charlemagne and Arthur—such was the moral and intellectual education which the young man received. It engraved on his mind a certain ideal of chivalry which some day he would seek to realise.

At fifteen he became a squire. There were *body squires* or *squires of honour*, who accompanied the lord and lady of the manor on horseback; *trencher squires*, who served at the lord's table; and *armed squires*, who bore their lord's lance and the various parts of his armour. The ideas of the period ennobled these menial offices. Only a noble might sample the seigniorial wine and food, or accompany the lady of the manor while passing through the forests. Religion and war, which had a dominant influence in the life of the Middle Ages, worked together to consecrate the initiation of the squire. He was led to the altar at the moment when he emerged from childhood into boyhood. His physical, military, and moral education was continued by violent exercise. Clothed in heavy armour, he cleared ditches and scaled walls; legends of knighthood developed more and more strongly in his mind this model of courage and virtue which poetry offered to his imagination under the names of Amadis, Roland, Oliver, and many other heroes. Added to this education, which developed the body and created a taste for heroic adventure, were the precepts of Christian religion, the salutary influence of which surrounded the future knight, instilling into him its principles. It will be understood then how holy and generous souls were formed, such as those of Godfrey of Bouillon and of Louis IX.

At the age of seventeen the squire often undertook distant expeditions. A ring hanging from an arm or leg announced that he had made a vow to accomplish some brilliant feat of valour

before receiving the honour of knighthood. At length, when he attained the age of twenty-one and seemed valiant and worthy to be dubbed a knight, he prepared for this initiation by symbolic ceremonies. The bath, sign of the purity of body and soul, the armed vigil, the confession, often made aloud, and the communion, preceded the reception of a new knight. Clothed in white linen, another symbol of moral purity, he was led to the altar by two of his elders, proved knights who were his sponsors-in-arms. A priest said mass and consecrated his sword. The lord who was to arm the new knight struck him with the flat of his sword, saying, "I dub thee knight in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." He caused him to swear that he would consecrate his arms to defend the weak and oppressed; he then gave him the accolade and girded on his sword. The sponsors-in-arms clothed the new knight in various pieces of armour, including a pair of gilded spurs, a distinctive sign of knightly dignity. The ceremony was often ended by a tournament. "Knighthood conferred privileges and imposed duties. Formed into a society and bound together by a common sentiment of honour and brotherhood, knights mutually defended each other. But if one of them was found wanting in loyalty or honour he was declared a *felon*, solemnly degraded and delivered up to capital punishment. Courtesy and respect for women were knightly virtues." Thus this society, though so violent, knew how to form for itself an ideal of perfection. Man during the Middle Ages had as his model in religious life his patron saint; in civil or political life, the knight.

CHAPTER XXI

LOUIS VI. THE FAT (1108–1137) AND THE COMMUNES

Extent of the Royal Demesne at the End of the Tenth Century.—The royal demesne had been greatly reduced since the time when Hugh Capet had united to it the whole duchy of France. Philip I. at the time of his death only possessed the counties of Paris, Melun, Orleans, and Sens; nor did he control the communications between these various towns.

Between Paris and Étampes lay the castle of the lord of Montlhéry; between Paris and Melun, the town of Corbeil, whose count hoped some day to found a fourth dynasty; and, lastly, between Paris and Orleans, the castle of Puiset, the capture of

which cost Louis VI. three years of war. Nearer still to Paris lived the lords of Montmorency and Dammartin; and in the east the Counts of Montfort, Meulan, and Mantes, all of whom plundered merchants and pilgrims despite royal safe-conducts. "My dear son," said Philip to Louis VI. one day, pointing out to him the castle of Montlhéry at the gates of Paris, "be careful to keep that tower which gave me so much trouble. I have grown old in fighting for it and attacking it." In the north the king still had, as Duke of France, powerful vassals in the Counts of Ponthieu (Montreuil and later Abbeville), Amiens, Soissons, Clermont in Beauvais, Valois and Vermandois, two fiefs then united in the hands of a brother of Philip I. South of the Loire the king had just bought the viscounty of Bourges, and the other lords, of Berry, the Prince of Deols (Chateauroux), and the Sieur of Bourbon (Moulins), paid him direct homage.

Great Vassals of the Crown and Ecclesiastical Feudalism.—Around the royal demesne stretched vast feudal principalities whose possessors rivalled the king in wealth and power. They were: in the north, the Count of Flanders; in the west, the Duke of Normandy and his refractory vassal the Duke of Brittany; in the south-west, the Count of Anjou, from whom the king received homage as Duke of France; in the east, the Count of Champagne; and in the south-east, the Duke of Burgundy. Further, beyond the Loire were the Duke of Aquitaine and Gascony and the Counts of Toulouse and Barcelona with their innumerable vassals, for each fief was in its turn divided in the same manner as the kingdom. The clergy themselves occupied an important place in the feudal hierarchy. Their chiefs were dukes, counts, and lords, possessing all the regalian rights exercised by the other suzerains, so that with the exception of five or six towns possessed by the king, the whole of France belonged to the lords, lay or ecclesiastical, great or small, dukes and counts, bishops and abbots, lords-banneret bearing the standard, and simple knights who only hoisted the pennant. But royalty, now so enfeebled, yet possessed traditions of power, justice, national unity, and public order; it had rights but lacked strength; it would, however, acquire this strength if it fell into the hands of a brave and energetic prince.

Activity of Louis VI.: Good Order in His Demesnes: He protects the Churches.—While the French nation, roused from a torpor which had lasted for two centuries, went forth from all its frontiers at once to conquer England, Naples, and Jerusalem, and to found a kingdom in Spain, the indolent Philip I. slumbered

on the throne. This inertia of the Capetians presently gave rise to anger. "It is the duty of kings," said Suger, "to curb with a powerful hand and by virtue of the original rights of their office the boldness of the nobles who rend the state by interminable wars, afflicting the poor and destroying the churches." In the opinion of the Church and in that of the people, monarchy was called upon to be a protector rather than a military power. Hugh Capet had understood this when, instead of the globe of Charlemagne, ambitious emblem of conquering dominion, he only added to the sceptre the hand of justice. But under his fourth successor it was not enough for the king to arm himself with a pacific symbol, as St. Louis did at the foot of the Oak of Vincennes; the hand of justice had then to be a mailed fist. Louis VI. was a king after Suger's heart. Always on horseback, lance in hand, he fought untiringly against the nobles who plundered travellers or pillaged the property of the Church, and succeeded in introducing a certain amount of order and security into his narrow demesne of the Ile de France. The Counts of Corbeille and Mantes, the lords of Montmorency, Puiset, Coucy, and Montfort were forced to respect the merchants and clergy. All the weak and the oppressed flocked round the protecting standard which he raised. The clergy placed their books at his service; "For," says Suger, "the glory of the Church of God lies in the union of the monarchy and the priesthood." Louis procured new allies by intervening in the municipal revolution of the lower classes.

Movement in the Urban and Rural Population.—Bishop Adelbero, in a Latin poem addressed to King Robert, only recognised two classes in society: the clergy who prayed, the nobles who fought; in a class far below them came the serfs and *manants* who laboured, but did not count in the state. These men, however, whom Bishop Adelbero did not count, alarmed him. He had a sorrowful presentiment of an approaching revolution. "Customs are changing," he cried, "the social order is shaken." Such is the complaint of the fortunate against every demand made by the poor. Adelbero's fear was justified. A revolution was beginning which was to deliver the *manants* from servitude to raise them to the level of those who were then masters of the country. But this revolution required seven hundred years to mature.

New Towns.—In the eighth century the serfs were not far enough removed from the old days of slavery to have won the right of living with their wives and children on the land which

they rendered fruitful by their toil. But two centuries later they were all settled in families ; their cottage and the adjoining ground had become an inheritance for them. The kindred spirit was followed by the spirit of association. When those dwelling-places of serfs were situated near a stream of water, a high road, fertile lands, or on the slope of a hill easy of defence, if the master was not too hard, they multiplied and became a village ; if they possessed enough strong arms and resources they would build a church there, and the bishop would form a new rural division, a parish. This parish only existed at first as an ecclesiastical division ; but the cure there held those records of public acts which, according to Roman law, were inscribed in the municipal registers in the towns. The Church was the first to organise rural communities ; a second step was made when the lord's steward, charged with maintaining the police of the village, and often a serf himself, selected some *vilains* to act with him as assessors. In a great many villages things remained at that point for a long time ; but those which grew into towns where there was industry, commerce, and wealth, the means, in fact, of resisting exactions, were inspired in the eleventh century by fresh ambitions and, as the lords had rendered the royal authority purely nominal, and as the vassals had often equally undermined that of their lords, so the serfs wished to extinguish the rights of their masters over their lands and persons.

Ancient Cities and Remains of Old Urban Institutions.—These ambitions did not appear only in the towns which had risen around abbeys and châteaux. The Roman Empire had also left a great number of cities in Gaul which were, in the midst of general confusion, the home of industry and commerce. Some of these, especially in the south, preserved their municipal organisation, their senate, and even enlarged the jurisdiction of their popularly elected magistrates. Others only preserved traces of this ancient organisation. But in all of them the memory of former liberty remained ; it awakened in them with force when, the multiplication of feudal families and the increasing luxury having augmented the number and claims of the lords, oppression reached its height.

Struggle in Various Places to secure Charters of Communes (1066).—As early as the year 997, during the reign of King Robert, the *vilains* of Normandy had attempted a general insurrection. " Why," said they, witnessing with simple eloquence to the equality of all men in strength and suffering :—

"'Pourquoi nous laisser faire dommage?
Nous sommes hommes comme ils sont;
Des membres avont comme ils ont;
Et de tout autant grands cœurs avons;
Et tout autant souffrir pouvons.'"[1]

They bound themselves together by oath and deputies from all districts united in a general assembly. But conspiracy was discovered, and its leaders, surprised by the Count of Evreux and his knights, were subjected to appalling tortures: some were roasted at a slow fire, some were sprinkled with molten lead, some were impaled, others were left with eyes gouged out or hands cut off or hamstrung, in order to spread terror in the countryside. In 1024 a revolt of the Breton peasants occurred. The conflict was sanguinary, many nobles perished; but the insurrection was drowned in the blood of the peasants. These cruelties seemed to succeed, and the lords, seeing the resignation of rural districts, thought they had seen the last of this temerity; the peasants alone, indeed, could do nothing. But after some years the movement began again, this time in the midst of the old cities and the new towns.

Some of them rebelled about the middle of the eleventh century in order to obtain the right of self-government by elected magistrates. Others, profiting by the need of the nobles who were anxious to go on the crusade, bought concessions; others again, who had preserved their local and elective administration since the time of the Romans, augmented their privileges. In short, for various causes, an eager desire for liberty disturbed all the towns in the north of France. Le Mans (1066), then Cambrai (1076), gave the signal, followed by Noyon, Beauvais, St. Quentin, Laon, Amiens, and Soissons, all of which extorted from their lords charters of communes. "Commune," said Gilbert of Nogent, who wrote in the twelfth century, "commune is a new name, and detestable. This is what one understands by that word: the taxable only render to their lords their just dues once a year. If they commit any crime they are free on paying a fine legally fixed." Thus the reign of law which the people (*manants*) had secured in place of arbitrary rule was the detestable thing which the old writer condemned. It was indeed the ruin of feudal society, because it was an endeavour to set a limit to violence. But the society which perishes through its own faults always attributes its downfall to that order by which it is replaced.

[1] From the *Roman de Rou*, by the Anglo-Norman poet, Robert Wace, Canon of Bayeux, who died in England 1184.

Intervention of the King in this Revolution.—This movement was general. It was felt throughout the whole of France, and though the citizens were in no sense united the cause was everywhere the same: the oppression of the lords. Louis VI., however, played a part in this revolution ; in conflict with the same enemy, feudalism, he seconded by design this insurrection which assured to him allies in the very midst of the territories of those against whom he fought. He confirmed eight charters of communes, that is to say, he granted royal sanction and guarantee to the treaties for peace concluded between the rebel vassals and their lords, which established the concessions obtained by the people (*manants*). This clever policy at once gave immense power to the petty prince who held the title of King of France, for it recognised him as the patron of those who were later known as the third state. The devotion of the people towards the king which survived so long in France dated from that time. It is true that if Louis the Fat favoured the creation of communes on the lands of the lords, he did not allow the establishment of one in his own demesne, where he only granted letters of partial liberty. He wished to remain master at home, and some day to become master of his turbulent vassals.

History of the Commune of Laon (1066–1228).—The history of the commune of Laon is one of the many dramas of which the north of France was then the theatre. Laon at the end of the eleventh century was a rich and industrious city, whose bishop ruled as lord, but where, because of its very riches, the greatest disorder reigned. Nobles pillaged the burghers, the burghers pillaged the peasants when they came to market in the town, and the bishop always imposed the heaviest taxes. In 1106, a Norman called Gaudy, a passionate and arrogant man with habits more suited to a soldier than to an ecclesiastic, bought the bishopric. With such a lord, the miserable condition of the burghers of Laon grew worse and they began to seek means for remedying it. At that time there was much talk of the justice and order maintained in the commune of Noyon and of the good peace which reigned there. The establishment of a commune seemed to be the necessary remedy. The bishop was then in England. The burghers offered to his clergy and to the knights of the town a sum of money for authority to institute an elective magistracy. It was composed of a mayor and twelve sworn officials who had the right to summon the people by ringing a bell, to judge offences committed in the town and its outskirts, and to cause their judgments to be executed. The

bishop, on his return, sold his consent, then swore to respect the privileges of the new commune. The burghers, in order to secure all guarantees, bought that also of Louis VI.

But three years later, in 1112, the money given by the burghers had all been spent; the bishop repented of the concession which he had made. He invited the king to come to Laon for the festival of Easter, and promised to the prince, if he would withdraw his consent to the charter of commune, the sum of seven hundred livres of silver which he hoped to levy from his burghers when they had once more become taxable at discretion. This perjury excited great commotion in the town; the bishop took no notice of it and prepared the list of contributions; but on the fourth day there was a great clamour in the street and a crowd of people were heard shouting *Commune! Commune!* The house of the bishop was at once surrounded; the nobles who hurried to its defence were killed, and Gaudy himself, discovered in a cellar, was killed by the blow of an axe.

As always happens with a mob, it went too far. Instead of maintaining its rights without violence, it had shed blood, and the blood of a prince of the Church. The burghers were terrified at what they had done; to find protection against the anger of the king they begged Thomas de Marle, a neighbouring lord, to defend the town, offering him a sum of money. Thomas was not the man to fear war against the king, but he did not consider himself strong enough to defend a great town against him. He therefore advised the inhabitants to abandon their city and follow him to his castle of Coucy. Those who were most implicated accepted this offer. The remainder awaited the course of events. At first the peasants of the neighbourhood rushed upon the town to plunder it, and Thomas himself led his vassals to the pillage. Then the partisans of the bishop and all the nobles tracked the burghers wherever they could overtake them and avenged by further murders those which had already been committed.

Meanwhile, Thomas of Marle, excommunicated and pursued by a royal army, increased by a levy *en masse* of the peasants, was reduced to giving up the fugitives of Laon. Most of them were hanged, and their bodies remained without burial. Then the king entered the town and the commune was abolished. But sixteen years had not passed before the cause of the burghers and the ideas of liberty once more gained the ascendancy. The successor of Bishop Gaudy swore in 1128 to a new charter which the king again ratified.

Character and Consequences of the Communal Revolution.—This communal revolution was guilty of that excess often provoked by the treachery and violence of the opposite party. This is unfortunately true of every period. But it is impossible to help admiring in these *manants* of the eleventh and twelfth centuries the perseverance with which they struggled to escape feudal oppression, to substitute order for disorder, law for arbitrary rule, to obtain a good peace, to adopt the phrase of the last charter of Laon. Their efforts were defeated because they remained isolated, because each town only thought of its own liberty; and the monarchy which became all-powerful in the fourteenth century annulled the charters of communes. They had, however, been numerous enough to enable a new people to form itself under their protection; when the communes disappeared, the third state appeared, and the general liberties of the nation began at the moment when the local liberties of some towns ceased.

Increasing Power of the King.—"The king was seen," said Suger, "unceasingly riding with a few knights to introduce order as far as the frontiers of Berry, Auvergne, and Burgundy, from which it clearly appeared that the efficacy of royal virtue was not contained within the limits of any definite place." His soldiers, the knights, often deserted him or supported him half-heartedly. It was only with the help of the militia of the Church and of the communes that he captured and demolished the castle of Crecy, a haunt of brigands and the property of the Sieur Hugh de Puiset, "that ravening wolf who desolated all the district of Orleans. The siege of the château was protracted; on the knights refusing one day to go to the assault, a poor bald priest arrived with one of the communal forces of the neighbourhood and ran unarmed as far as the palisades; he tore up some of them, and calling his men to help, they effected a breach and entered the castle." Louis caused it to be razed to the ground and erected on the site of the cursed tower a public market. These efforts of Louis to protect the weak and to discipline feudal society were rewarded. In his war against Henry I., King of England, the communal militia grouped themselves round his oriflamme; and on the news of the projected attack by the emperor, a numerous army of burghers and vassals held themselves in readiness to defend him.

Conflict with Henry I., King of England.—In the war against Henry I., Louis proposed to secure Normandy for William Clito, nephew of the English king. It was an able project the

success of which would have removed an imminent peril from the French crown, united as England was to the duchy of Normandy; but Louis was defeated at Brenville (1119). Otherwise this check had no serious consequences, for the English king, fighting against his suzerain, dared not press the war to extremes, fearing that his example, the rebellion of a vassal against his lord, would induce his own vassals to act in the same way towards him; but the plan of Louis VI. failed; Clito did not secure Normandy.

Wreck of the "White Ship."—Some time after this a terrible misfortune befell King Henry. As he was embarking at Barfleur, according to Orderic Vitalis, a Norman called Thomas Fitz-Stephen came to him and, offering him a gold mark, said, "My father served your family at sea all his life; it was on his ship that your father was borne to England when he went to fight against Harold. My lord king, grant me in fief the same office. I have for your royal service a vessel thoroughly equipped, known as the *White Ship*." The king answered, "I have chosen the vessel on which I shall cross, but I willingly entrust to you my sons, William and Richard, and all their retinue." By order of the king nearly three hundred persons embarked on the *White Ship*. There were great barons, among them eighteen ladies of noble birth, daughters, sisters, nieces, or wives of kings and counts. All this brilliant youth prepared joyously for the voyage. They gave wine to the fifty oarsmen, and drove away with derision the priests who wished to bless the vessel. Meanwhile, night fell, but the moon illumined the still surface of the waters, the young princes begged Thomas, the captain, to urge on the oarsmen so that they might overtake the king's vessel which was already far ahead. The crew, excited by the wine, eagerly obeyed, and in order to take the shortest route, the captain coasted close by the Race of Catteville, which is bordered by rocks just below the surface of the water. The *White Ship* struck one of them violently, a gaping hole was made. A terrible cry arose from the whole crew; but the water gained. All became silent. Two men seized hold of the mainyard, Berold, a butcher of Rouen, and young Godfrey, son of Gilbert of the Eagle. They saw a man's head appearing in the water; it was Thomas, the pilot, who, after having plunged into the waves, came up again to the surface. "What has become of the king's son?" he asked them. "He has not reappeared, neither he nor his brother, nor any of the family," answered the two shipwrecked men. "Woe is me!"

cried Thomas, and he sank once more into the sea. Young Godfrey of the Eagle could not stand the cold of that freezing night of December; he loosed his hold of the yard, and allowed himself to sink to the bottom, after having commended his companion to God. Berold, the butcher, the poorest of the shipwrecked company, who was picked up the next morning by some fishermen, alone remained to recount the disaster. "Fatal disaster!" cried a poet of the age, "which plunges in the deep the flower of our nobility. Princes become the playthings of the waves. The purple and fine linen will rot in the watery depths, and the fishes will devour him who was born of the blood of kings!"

It was from a child that King Henry first heard the terrible news. At the first words he fell to the ground as if thunderstruck, and from that day he was never seen to smile.

Union of Normandy, England, and Anjou.—This misfortune was also fatal to France. Henry had now only a daughter, Matilda; he declared her his heir. Matilda was the widow of the Emperor Henry V.; in 1127 she married Geoffrey, Count of Anjou, surnamed Plantagenet, owing to his habit of placing a sprig of flowering broom in his cap in lieu of a feather. Until that time, the kings of France had been able to obtain the help of Anjou against Normandy. The marriage of Matilda put an end to this policy, and carried the Anglo-Norman dominion as far as the Loire. Another marriage, that of Matilda's son with Eleanor of Guienne, carried it as far as the Pyrenees.

Murder of the Count of Flanders (1127).—In the same year that Louis VI. saw the formation of that threatening union, another catastrophe held out to him the hope of compensation. Flanders at that period was already covered with industrial cities, and its citizens, numerous and proud, had little respect for the social distinctions which were powerful elsewhere. A great many serfs had slipped in among them and had acquired wealth and power. The revolution which has already been described as causing civil war in the north of France broke out of its own accord in the county of Flanders. In 1127, the chief of the province after the count was a serf, Bertholf, provost of the chapter-house of St. Donatien of Bruges. He had married his nephews and nieces into the oldest families of the country, and on one occasion he had no difficulty in securing the services of five hundred knights in a private war against a gentleman who was his enemy. Moreover, Count Charles the Good, a pious man and full of kindness to the poor, but also of the old school in the

opinion of Bishop Adelbero, caused inquiry to be made throughout his county to ascertain the positions of individuals and to bring back to servitude those who had not legally been freed from it. He even issued an edict which degraded free men who had married a woman descended from serfs ; a year and a day after his marriage he himself became a serf. The provost and all his people, directly threatened, plotted to assassinate the count, and one day murdered him as he was praying in the church of St. Donatien. This murder excited a great scandal. The body of the count was honoured as that of a saint ; the people of Gand, jealous of those of Bruges, appeared armed to recover his body. All the knights of the country prepared for war, for or against the traitors, who, besieged in the castle of Bruges, and afterwards in the very church where the murder had been committed, defended themselves with much bloodshed. King Louis, suzerain of the count, himself came with William Clito to attack them there and obliged them to surrender. The chiefs perished in terrible tortures ; the others, numbering one hundred and eleven, were hurled from the top of the tower of Bruges. Louis then invested Clito with the county of Flanders, in compensation for Normandy, which he had been unable to secure for him. But this was not the end of that bloody tragedy ; the relations and friends of the provost aroused Gand, Lille, Furnes, and Alost in rebellion against Clito, and appealed to Count Thierry of Alsace. Clito died in that war of a wound which he had received before Alost. The influence of Louis VI. in Flanders died out with him.

Influence of Louis VI. in the South.—Louis was more successful in the south, where he was able to exercise his influence and authority. The Bishop of Clermont, being at war with the Count of Auvergne, appealed for royal assistance and obtained it (1121). Again molested, he once more called upon the king, who this time crossed the Loire with a numerous army in which fought the Counts of Flanders, Brittany, and Anjou. He captured the castle of Montferrand, ordered one hand of all the prisoners to be cut off, and sent them back, each carrying in his remaining hand the one which had been amputated. The Duke of Aquitaine himself came to beg forgiveness for his vassal (1126). Two lords were contending for Bourbon ; Louis decided the question, but one of them refused to accept his decision ; he compelled him to do so by force of arms. Thus the king, having assumed the character during a period of trouble and violence " of a great judge to promote peace in the country," gradually found his

lost authority returning to him. It soon acquired greater strength than ever.

One of the last acts of Louis created a great stir and illustrated the novel character of royalty. Thomas of Marle had started his depredations anew. He confined in his prisons a number of merchants whom he had despoiled on the highway, in spite of their possession of safe-conducts from the king; in addition to this he wished to extract a ransom from them. He felt secure from interference behind the ramparts of his castle of Coucy, one of the strongest north of the Seine. The king led his troops to the foot of those walls believed to be impregnable. Thomas left the castle to lay an ambush, but was wounded, captured, and taken to Laon, where he died. His death was a deliverance to the whole country.

Three Popes in France.—The Investiture Controversy, that rivalry between the holy see and the empire which began under Gregory VII., had not yet come to an end, and the popes, driven from Rome by force of arms or the intrigues of the emperor, sought refuge and help in France. Gelasius II. died there. Calixtus II. was elected there, and to end this great discussion a council assembled at Reims in 1119 at which fifteen archbishops, over two hundred bishops, and an equal number of abbots were present. This assembly promulgated several canons against those guilty of simony and all those who exacted a fee for baptisms and funerals. Further, marriage of clerks was insisted upon; the Truce of God was again confirmed and the licentiousness of princes was condemned. Three years later the negotiations begun by Calixtus II. at Reims with the emperor ended in the Concordat of Worms, the first of those difficult treaties of peace which regulated the relations of the two powers, temporal and spiritual.

In 1130 a double election took place at Rome. Innocent II., forced to yield that town to his rival, took refuge in France. Louis the Fat assembled at Étampes a council which examined the claims of the two rivals, and at the proposal of St. Bernard declared in favour of Innocent II. In the following year, this pontiff held a fresh council at Reims, at which thirteen archbishops and two hundred and sixty-three bishops were present. There he anointed as king the young son of Louis the Fat. France thus became the asylum of popes and the scene of discussions on great ecclesiastical matters. Royalty could but gain by playing this rôle of the protector of popes.

Abelard.—At the time when the grave scandal of the conflict

between pope and emperor ended, the great quarrel began which divided the School during the whole of the Middle Ages, that of *realists* and *nominalists*, obscure but influential discussions which produced a revival of intellectual activity. William of Champeaux, son of a labourer of Brie, preached the realist doctrine with great brilliancy at the cloister school of Notre-Dame of Paris, and later at the abbey of St. Victor, which he founded in 1113 in the district which still bears that name. But he was eclipsed by one of his disciples, Abelard, a noble and handsome youth endowed with the power of fascination and with genius which prevented him from escaping popularity even when he retired into the desert. Alike in his teaching and in his writings, Abelard trenched at times upon the sphere of theology, which at that period invaded every branch of knowledge. St. Bernard, the greatest ecclesiastic of that period and one of the greatest teachers of all time, suspected a vein of heresy in the writings of this brilliant professor and denounced them. The Council of Soissons caused Abelard's book on the Trinity to be burnt (1122); and the Council of Sens again condemned it in 1140. Abelard died two years later, a monk at Cluny. His eloquence and his struggle against St. Bernard made him famous in his own day, his misfortunes and the love of Heloïse have rendered his name a popular memory to our own time.

CHAPTER XXII

LOUIS VII. THE YOUNG (1137–1180)

Louis VII. (1137–1180): His Marriage with Eleanor of Guienne.—Louis the Fat left six sons, of whom three entered the Church; of the others, one, Robert, was head of the house of Dreux, another, Peter, was head of that house of Courtenay which still exists in England. The eldest, Louis VII. the Young, had previous to the death of his father made a brilliant marriage. He married Eleanor of Guienne, heiress of Poitou and of the duchy of Aquitaine. It had become an established custom that women could inherit fiefs, could receive homage, judge their vassals, and lead them to war. This law, of which the house of France had no need to avail itself during three hundred and thirty years, and which it repudiated when the direct line of Hugh Capet became extinct, was one of the most active causes in effecting the ruin of feudal families which war constantly

decimated. The women carried the fiefs by marriage from house to house until most of them merged into that of France, which endured while the other houses became extinct. The dower of Eleanor was the richest which had yet been received by one of the French kings, being no less than one-half of southern France. Unfortunately Louis VII. did not retain it.

Continuation of the Policy of Louis the Fat (1137–1147).—Louis the Young continued the policy of his father. "The churches of Angoulême, Cluny, Clermont, Puy, and Vezelay having implored his protection," says Suger, "he allowed them to take refuge under his shield, to defend them he seized the rod of chastisement." A Count of Châlons and a Sieur of Montjai, among others, were deprived of their fiefs on account of their acts of violence. A war with the Count of Champagne must be traced to a different cause. The pope had nominated his own nephew to the Archbishopric of Bourges, disregarding the royal right of presentation. Louis drove the new prelate from his see, he found shelter with the Count of Champagne. The king had an old grievance against this lord. In an attempt which he had made to seize Toulouse the Count of Champagne had refused his feudal service. Louis the Young grasped the opportunity of humiliating this insubordinate vassal; he entered his lands with an army, ravaged them, and burned the little town of Vitry. Thirteen hundred people who had taken sanctuary in the church perished in the flames.

The Second Crusade (1147).—This was an all too common occurrence, but it weighed on the conscience of the king, and to expiate his crime Louis took the cross. His father owed his success partly to the fact that the richest of the lords had drained all their resources to go to Jerusalem and that many had never returned. Thus it was a mistake to give up this system. But no king had taken part in the first crusade; their reputation and their piety had suffered accordingly. The emperor, on this occasion, decided to go on the crusade; the King of France could not remain behind and abandon the kingdom which the Franks had founded on the banks of the Jordan, where civil discord and corruption had appeared and where the state was already tending to ruin under the combined weight of internal evils and external attacks. The Atabegs of Aleppo had captured Edessa, where they massacred all the Christian population, and Noureddin was threatening Palestine. Despite the prudent advice of Abbot Suger, Louis resolved to put himself at the head of a second expedition to the Holy Land. The crusade was

preached in France and in Germany by St. Bernard ; but enthusiasm had considerably declined. A general tax levied throughout the whole kingdom and over all grades of society, nobles, priests, or peasants, caused much discontent; at Sens the burghers killed the Abbot of St. Peter le Vif, lord of a part of their town, on account of an impost which he attempted to raise. "The king," said a contemporary, "started on his way in the midst of curses. St. Bernard was offered the command of the expedition ; he remembered Peter the Hermit and refused."

Louis, having taken the oriflamme at St. Denis, travelled through Metz and Germany towards Constantinople. Emperor Manuel sent envoys from a great distance to meet him. The French feudal lords resented the base flatteries of the Greeks, whom one of their number interrupted, saying, "Do not talk so much of the glory, the piety, and the wisdom of the king ; he knows it and we know it. Tell us briefly what you have to say." Manuel was alarmed ; what he desired was that the crusaders should swear to him an oath of fealty. They consented, as they had done at the time of the first crusade, but not without muttered threats. Already the Germans were in the midst of Asia Minor. But betrayed by their Greek guides they became entangled in the defiles of Mount Taurus and fell by the sword of the Turks. Conrad returned almost alone to Constantinople.

Louis, warned of the danger, advanced along the coast and secured his passage by the victory of Meander. But, in the neighbourhood of Laodicea, his army went inland to the mountains. The incompetency of its leaders and the indiscipline of the soldiers caused a preliminary disaster at the start. The king's life was in imminent danger ; for a long time he fought single-handed, all the nobles of his escort having been slain. "Noble flowers of France," says a chronicler, "who faded before having carried their fruits beneath the walls of Damascus." At Stalia it was found to be impossible to advance farther. The king and the nobles embarked on Greek ships to finish their pilgrimage by sea, abandoning the crowd of pilgrims, who perished beneath the arrows of the Turks, or who, accusing Christ of having deceived them, became Mussulmans. Three thousand thus escaped death.

Louis, having arrived at Antioch, thought no more of battles, but only of fulfilling his vow of pilgrimage, of praying at the Holy Sepulchre, and of ending as quickly as possible this unfortunate undertaking. Without attending to the request of the Prince of Antioch and the Count of Tripoli that he should remain

with them, he hastened his journey to Jerusalem. The people, the princes, and the prelates came out to meet him bearing olive branches and singing, " Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." It was necessary to act, and at least once to unsheathe the sword on holy ground. An attack on Damascus, one of the sacred towns of Islam and the pearl of the East, was suggested. Surrounded by immense gardens watered by the various branches of the Barradi and forming around it a forest of oranges, citrons, cedars, and trees laden with golden and luscious fruit, it was the capital of the desert and for Syria a bulwark or a perpetual menace, according to whether it was in the hands of friends or enemies. The attack seemed at first to succeed ; the gardens were taken, but the Christian princes quarrelled over the skin of the bear before having killed it. The choice of the Count of Flanders as Prince of Damascus offended the others. They served with less zeal a cause become that of a single man, and allowed time for the Mussulman reinforcements to arrive, for the bear to show that he still had teeth and claws. They were obliged to raise the siege and return to Palestine. Again, few of those who had left Europe returned. The first crusade had at least attained its end, it had delivered Jerusalem ; the second had uselessly shed Christian blood. By it Palestine was weakened, Islam was strengthened, and the crusaders brought back only shame from their enterprise, or, as in the case of Louis VII., dishonour.

Divorce of Louis VII. (1152): Vast Possessions of the King of England in France.—On his return, the king found his territory in a peaceful condition, thanks to the able administration of Suger. But he repudiated his wife Eleanor, who carried her duchy of Guienne to Henry Plantagenet, Count of Anjou, Duke of Normandy, and heir to the crown of England (1152). When, two years later, Henry entered into possession of his heritage, and when he added Brittany to it by the marriage of one of his sons with the only daughter of the count of that country, he became master of almost the whole of western France.

Diversions Favourable to Louis VII.—The King of France might well tremble for his crown. But Henry II., forced to respect him as his suzerain, if he would obtain a like respect from his vassals, hesitated to attack him. On one occasion he threatened Toulouse, but Louis hastened to the spot with a few knights and threw himself into the place. Henry at once retreated because the town was strong and thickly populated, but also to avoid a direct conflict with him whom feudal law

forbade him to fight. Louis also found means to defend himself by sustaining the continual revolts of the four sons of Henry II. against their father. The violence of the King of England gave him another ally, a saint. Some servants of this prince assassinated Thomas à Becket, the Archbishop of Canterbury, at the very foot of the altar. The dead bishop was more formidable than he had ever been during his lifetime. Louis demanded vengeance for the martyr from the pope; and to forestall excommunication, Henry submitted to all the humiliations which were imposed upon him. He spent his last days fighting against his subjects, his sons, and the King of France.

Administration of Louis VII.: Suger.—Louis VII. was rather a monk on the throne than an active and resolute monarch. However, he still seconded the communal movement. Twenty-five charters are signed with his name. But like his father, he would not grant them on his own territory. At Orleans a rising of burghers was harshly put down. At times he even helped the lords to act in their demesnes as he did in his; thus Abbot Pons, at the word of the king, overthrew the commune of Vezelai, the dramatic history of which is still on record. The policy which Louis favoured helped the progress of urban population. Under him, said a chronicler, many towns were built and many of the old ones were enlarged. Forests were cut down and vast spaces cleared. He confirmed the ancient privileges of the Hansa, or the society of the merchants of Paris; and Pope Alexander III. laid in 1163 the foundation stone of the cathedral of that town, the church of Notre-Dame. Louis VII. in his lifetime caused his son, Philip Augustus, to be crowned, and attached the privilege of coronation to the cathedral of Reims. The peers were seated at the ceremony.

Suger, born of humble parents in the neighbourhood of St. Omer, was brought up by the monks of St. Denis. He deserved, by his common sense, by his mental activity, and by his devotion to the interests of the king and the kingdom, the friendship of Louis VI., who had been a fellow-pupil with him at the abbey, and the confidence of Louis VII. Elected by the monks to the abbey of St. Denis while he was travelling to Rome, he renounced the pomp with which prelates surrounded themselves and devoted all his resources to decorating the interior of the church and to rebuilding the towers and gateway constructed by Dagobert. Louis VII. named him as regent during the crusade; Suger showed the same modesty and ability which introduced order into the finances of the king and secured peace in the kingdom.

It is true that the departure of so many turbulent lords rendered the task an easy one; and if the name of Suger is placed among those of the three or four great ministers whose memory is honoured in France, it must be recognised that his services cannot be compared with those of Sully, Richelieu, and Colbert. But he had in common with them a perception of the duties of monarchy and the need of order. His words to Louis VI. have been recorded above; in a letter to Louis VII., urging him to return from the crusade, he adjured him by his coronation oath "not to abandon the flock too long to the fury of the wolves."

During the reign of Louis the Young, the building of the existing cathedral of Tours was begun. It had already been burnt down twice, in 561 and 1166. Archbishop Joscion laid its foundation stone in 1170, but it was not completed until 1547; Henry IV. called its twin towers "beautiful jewels which only lacked a setting." It is needless to add that in that monument which was four centuries in the building all styles appear, from the Roman, at the foot of the towers, to the Renaissance, which crowns the summit.

SIXTH PERIOD—THE FIRST VICTORY OF THE MONARCHY OVER THE FEUDAL ARISTOCRACY

(1180–1328)

CHAPTER XXIII

PHILIP AUGUSTUS AND LOUIS VIII. (1180–1226)

Character of this Period.—From the ninth to the twelfth century there was indeed a king, but monarchy in the true sense did not exist, since that central power which should have remained in the hands of the crown had become localised and was exercised by all the great landowners. The revolution which had destroyed the unity of the country for three centuries was succeeded by another which strove to reunite the scattered members of French society and to deprive the lords of rights which they had usurped in order to restore them to the crown, thus rendering the king the sole judge, administrator, and legislator of the country. This change began in the reigns of Philip Augustus and St. Louis who revived a central government; but was not completed until the age of Louis XIV., owing to various incidents—the Hundred Years' War in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the Wars of Religion in the sixteenth—which delayed this great internal work.

Philip Augustus (1180–1223): Acquisition of Several Provinces. — Philip II. surnamed Augustus, owing to his birth occurring in the month of August, ascended the throne at the age of fifteen. His relatives and vassals expected to obtain an easy advantage over a child; but instead of that, he imposed on them by his activity and determination. As a result of the wars which he was obliged to maintain, he acquired in 1135 the counties of Amiens, Vermandois, and Valois. Artois, which he had inherited from his wife in 1191, carried the immediate dominion of the crown to the frontiers of Flanders. The Duke of Burgundy, the Sieur of Beaujeu, and the Count of Châlons, who pillaged churches, were forced to respect them. He banished the Jews, appropriating their lands and houses (1182), and caused a number of *paterins* or heretics to be burned. Lastly,

the royal forces united with the commons put down with extreme severity an insurrection of *cottereux*, bands of brigands who ravaged the centre of France.

Third Crusade (1190–1191).—Philip, like his father, undertook a crusade. His object was to recover Jerusalem, which in 1187 had fallen into the hands of the infidels. Eight kings, all of them French, had reigned there since the time of Godfrey of Bouillon. The last, Guy of Lusignan, had just been taken prisoner by Saladin at the Battle of Tiberius. Christendom made a great effort; Richard Cœur de Lion, King of England, and Philip Augustus set out together. Emperor Frederic Barbarossa had preceded them. The recapture of Acre, however, marked the limit of their success.

Rivalry between Philip Augustus and Richard.—During the protracted siege of that town the misunderstanding between the two kings came to a head. Eclipsed by his brilliant rival, Philip hastened back to France in order to plan the overthrow of the too powerful house of England. He allied himself with John Lackland, Richard's brother, whom that king had left behind him; the two allies hoped to divide the spoils between them. But Richard, escaped from the prison where he had been dishonourably confined by the emperor, determined to avenge himself on his brother and his rival. The former won his pardon by murdering a French garrison which he had introduced into a castle; Philip Augustus accepted war, which began with violence in Normandy. Richard, troubadour and king, fought and sang together. He defeated Philip near Gisors, but without reaping much benefit from his victory. Pope Innocent II. interposed and compelled them to sign a truce of five years (January, 1199). Two months later Richard was killed by an arrow during the siege of Chalus in Limousin, from whence he wished to carry away a treasure which the lord of that castle had found.

Condemnation of John Lackland: Acquisition of Several Provinces (1204).—The brother of Cœur de Lion succeeded him (1199). The King of France at once became the enemy of his former ally and supported in opposition to him a pretender, young Arthur, son of an elder brother of John Lackland. Arthur was taken prisoner by his uncle and died shortly afterwards. The English king was accused as a murderer and Philip cited him to appear before the twelve great vassals of the crown or peers of the realm. On his refusal, Philip confiscated his fiefs and with an army entered Normandy. John did not defend the province, and the French took Gaillard, a stronghold built by Richard,

which resisted for six months. Pope Innocent III. attempted to impose peace on the two kings; Philip was gaining too much in this war against a faint-hearted enemy to put an end to it; he sent a proud reply to the pontiff and, vigorously following up his success, seized all the towns of the province, including Rouen, "the wealthy city, filled with noblemen and chiefs of the whole of Normandy." Anjou, Touraine, and Poitou were also easily annexed to the royal demesne. These were the most brilliant conquests that a king of France had yet effected (1203–1204).

Victory of Bouvines (1214).—Coward though he was, John could not resign himself to so much shame. He formed a vast coalition. While he in person was to attack France from the south-west, the Emperor Otto IV., the Counts of Flanders and Boulogne with all the princes of the Netherlands were to attack it from the north. But France roused herself to repel this foreign invasion. Philip's son, Louis, made progress against the English king in Poitou; and Philip with the remainder of the knights and the militia of the northern communes marched against the enemy whom he met at the bridge of Bouvines on the Marq, between Lille and Tournay (July 27). The chief leaders of the enemy, surrounded by forces estimated at 100,000 men, were so sure of victory that they divided the country between them beforehand.

The peril in which the King of France stood explains a fact which history has strangely distorted. Philip Augustus was represented as placing his crown upon the altar and saying, "It is for the most worthy." This dramatic story cannot be believed, but more credit may be placed upon the following narrative of an ancient chronicler: "The king," he says, "demanded a mass; when it had been said he caused bread and wine to be brought, then had some slices cut and ate one, after which he said to those around him, 'I beg all my true friends to eat with me in memory of the twelve apostles who, with our Lord, drank and ate, and if there is any one who thinks evil or treason, let him not draw near.' Then advanced Sieur Enguerrand of Coucy who took the first piece, and Count Walter of St. Pol next, saying to the king, 'Sire, it will be seen to-day whether I am a traitor.' He spoke these words because he knew that the king held him in suspicion on account of disquieting rumours. The Count of Sancerre took the third slice and the other barons followed; and there was so great a crowd that they could not all reach the sideboard which held the pieces of bread. When the king saw this, he was exceeding glad, and said to the barons, 'Lords,

you are all my men and I am your king, such as I am, and I have loved you greatly. . . . In the name of this I pray you to preserve to-day my honour and your own. And if you consider that the crown would be better worn by one of you than by me, I will withdraw willingly and with all my heart.' When the barons heard him speak thus they began to weep, saying, 'Sire, in the name of God, we thank you ! We would have no king but you. Moreover, ride boldly against your enemies for we are prepared to die with you.' "

The two armies remained for some time at a short distance from one another, neither daring to start the action, and the French retired by the bridge of Bouvines to march on Hainault, when the enemy, attacking the rear-guard, forced them to turn.

"Philip," said his chaplain, William the Breton, "was resting that moment under a tree, near a chapel, with his armour unbuckled ; at the first sound of fighting he entered the church to utter a short prayer, promptly armed himself, and sprang on his charger with as great a joy as if he had been going to a wedding or a banquet. Then shouts were heard along the field: 'To arms, warriors, to arms!' and the trumpets rang out. The king was in the forefront, without waiting for his banner, the oriflamme of St. Denis, woven of bright red silk, which was carried that day by a most valiant man, Galon de Montigni. Guérin, the bishop elect of Senlis, ordered the battle so that the French had the sun at their backs, while it shone in the eyes of the enemy. Three hundred burghers of Soissons, vassals of the Abbot of St. Medard, who served on horseback, opened the action on the right, boldly charging the knights of Flanders, who hesitated for some time to enter into conflict with common men. But the cry of *Death to the French!* uttered by one of their number, excited them, and the Burgundians, led by their duke, having come to reinforce the men of Soissons, the mêlée became furious. Count Ferrand fought on that side."

When the action began, the militia of the communes were already beyond Bouvines ; they recrossed the bridge in all haste, ran to the side of the royal ensign, and placed themselves in the centre, before the king and his battle array. The German knights, with Emperor Otto in their midst, charged these brave men and forced their way through them to penetrate to the king ; but the most renowned of the French warriors threw themselves in their path and checked them. During this conflict, the German infantry passed behind the cavalry and arrived at the place where Philip was fighting. They dragged him from his horse

and, when he was overthrown, tried to stab him through the visor of his helmet or some flaw in his armour. Montigni, who carried the standard of France, held up and waved his banner to summon help; a few knights and men of the communes rushed to the spot. They rescued the king, set him once more on his charger, and he again flung himself into the fray. The emperor, in his turn, was almost taken. William des Barres, the bravest and strongest knight in the whole army, successful adversary of Richard Cœur de Lion whom he had twice dismounted, already held Otto by his helm and was striking him violently when a crowd of enemies hurled themselves upon him. Unable to loosen his hold or to reach him, they killed his horse in order to throw him to the ground; but he extricated himself at once; alone and on foot, like a furious lion, he made a wide space around him with the help of his sword and dagger. Otto, at least, was able to escape.

On the right, Ferrand, Count of Flanders, had fallen wounded into the hands of the French; in the centre, the emperor fled with his German princes. But on the left, Reynold of Boulogne and the English held their ground. They had overcome the people of Dreux, Perche, Ponthieu, and Vimeu. "At that sight," said the poet chronicler, "Philip of Dreux, Bishop of Beauvais, was stricken with grief, and holding by chance a club in his hand, he forgot his calling and struck down the chief of the English and with him many others, breaking their limbs but shedding no blood, and bidding those round him to say that it was they who had done this great slaughter, fearing that he would be accused of having violated the canons and committed a deed unlawful to priests. The English were soon completely routed, with the exception of Reynold of Boulogne, who had placed a body of squires on foot in a double circle bristling with long pikes. He sprang from among them as if out of a fort in which he had been sheltering to take breath. In the end his horse was wounded, he himself fell and was captured. Five other counts and twenty-five knights-banneret had already been taken."

The return of the king to Paris was a triumphal progress; everywhere on his road the churchs rang with thanksgivings and the sweet hymns of the clergy mingled with the noise of bells and the harmonious notes of warlike music. The houses were hung with curtains and tapestries, the roads strewn with green boughs and fresh flowers. All the people, men, women, children, and old people, hastened to the cross-roads; all wished to see the Count

of Flanders, who, wounded and chained, lay in a litter; they said to him, "Ferrand, there you are now bound and in irons; you will never again have the power to rouse yourself and attack your master." At Paris the burghers, a crowd of clergy, scholars, and people went to meet the king, singing hymns and chants. Their festivities were unequalled; the day did not suffice them, and they feasted in the evening with many lights so that the night seemed as bright as the day. The scholars maintained the festival for a whole week. During these rejoicings the communal militia, which had conducted itself so valiantly in the battle, came in pomp to entrust its prisoners to the provost of Paris. One hundred and ten knights had fallen into its hands, not to mention the common soldiers. The king allowed some to be retained as hostages, the remainder he confined in the great and the small Chatelet of Paris. Ferrand was detained in the new tower of the Louvre, where he remained for thirteen years (1214). The abbey of *Victory* was built near Senlis; its ruins are still in existence.

Philip does not seem to have won from this great success all the advantages which it offered. He acquired no new territory; Flanders remained in the possession of the wife of Ferrand, the county of Boulogne in that of the daughter of Reynold, and John of England bought a truce which left him Saintonge and Guienne. But Philip had repelled a formidable invasion, caused an emperor and a king to fly before him, baffled the evil designs of several great vassals, and, lastly, given to the Capetian dynasty the baptism of glory which it had lacked till then, and revealed France to herself. This triumph gave rise to something hitherto unknown, the national spirit, patriotism; a feeble spirit still, despite the burst of rejoicings, and a spirit which seemed more than once to be extinguished, only to appear again with victorious energy. France had become a nation and had acquired a king.

Warlike Activity of the Nobility.—The nobility signalised its warlike activity during this reign by two great enterprises: the fourth crusade, which changed the Greek empire into a Frank empire, and the war against the Albigenses which annexed to France the refractory peoples of the south. Philip took part in neither expedition. He left the nobles to exhaust their resources and their turbulence in these wars which were doubly profitable to France, both by the order which they allowed to be established in the kingdom and by the glory which they shed on its name in distant lands. "I have at my side," he wrote to the pope, who

pressed him to engage in the holy war against the Albigenses, "two great and terrible lions, the Emperor Otto and King John; thus I am unable to leave France."

Fourth Crusade (1202–1204).—The fourth crusade, in which Villehardouin, the seneschal of the county of Champagne, took part and of which he recounted the history, was a special enterprise. Since the failure of the third crusade, Jerusalem had been forgotten, and instead of pious expeditions, the Christian world had been the scene only of wars between kings and peoples. England, Germany, and France, formerly united to deliver the Holy Sepulchre, armed themselves against each other. Emperor Otto IV. was excommunicated, Philip Augustus had been, John was to be, and these three excommunicates thought little of the Holy Land. The great Pope Innocent III. attempted to recall it to their minds. He caused a crusade to be proclaimed, promising the remission of their sins to those who served God for a year. Fulk, vicar of Neuilly-sur-Marne, preached the holy war. He went to a tournament which was being held at Champagne, and by his burning words persuaded all the princes and knights who were present to take the Cross. On this occasion the kings and the people alike held aloof. The crusaders resolved to travel by sea and sent a deputation to Venice in order to hire ships (1201). The republic demanded 85,000 silver marks and half the conquests which the expedition might make. As they could not pay so large a sum, Venice allowed them time on condition that they would help the republic to take Zara in Dalmatia. They consented and gave them besides Trieste and Istria (1202). The preliminary account thus settled, they were able to start, but were uncertain as to where they should go. The failure of the two last crusades showed them that it was necessary to have a base if they were to operate with any degree of success in Palestine, and this base could only be Egypt or the Greek Empire. The Venetians persuaded their allies that the keys of Jerusalem were at Cairo or Constantinople. There was some truth in this view, but it was primarily the outcome of commercial considerations. The possession of Cairo would open up the road to India to the merchants of Venice, that of Constantinople would secure for them the commerce of the Black Sea and the whole of the archipelago. They decided for Constantinople, to which Alexius, a young Greek prince, offered to guide them on condition that they would restore his father, Isaac Angelus Comnenus, who had been deposed, to the throne (1203).

When the French arrived at Constantinople, saw its high walls, its innumerable churches, the gilded domes of which glittered in the sun ; when they had cast their eyes, said Villehardouin, " far and wide over this town which was queen of all others, the boldest among them trembled, and each man looked at his arms, of which he would soon have need." On the shore a magnificent army of 60,000 men was lined up. The crusaders expected a terrible battle. All the warriors were rowed to the shore in boats. Even before their boats grounded " the knights, all armed, leapt into the sea waist deep, in battle array, sword in hand, with the brave archers, the sergeants, and the crossbowmen. And the Greeks made a great show of checking them. But when it came to lowered lances, the Greeks turned their backs, fleeing and leaving the shore in their possession. And true it is that no battlefield was ever more boldly won." On July 18, the town was carried by assault and the old emperor, drawn from his dungeon, was restored to his throne. Alexius had made the most dazzling promises to the crusaders : in order to keep them he imposed new taxes and so exasperated that feeble people that they strangled their emperor, created another, Murtzuplous, and closed the gates of the town. The crusaders at once attacked it. A whole quarter, a square league in extent, was burnt. How many masterpieces perished then!

Foundation of a Frank Empire at Constantinople (1204–1261).— Constantinople taken, they divided the empire between them. Baldwin IV., Count of Flanders, was elected emperor. Boniface, Marquis of Montferrat, was elected King of Macedonia. Villehardouin, Marshal of Roumania, and his nephew Prince of Achaia. There were dukes of Athens and Naxos, a count of Cephalonia, lords of Thebes and of Corinth. Venice kept a quarter of Constantinople, with all the ports of the empire and all the islands. It was a new France which rose, with its feudal customs, at the extremity of Europe. But these crusaders were not numerous enough to retain their conquest for any length of time. By 1261 the Latin empire crumbled to ruins. But until the end of the Middle Ages, and the conquest by the Turks, there still survived in various parts of Greece some of those feudal principalities so strongly established by the French of the thirteenth century in the land of Miltiades and Leonidas.

Crusade against the Albigenses (1208).—The crusade against the Albigenses was more directly profitable than that of Constantinople. The south of France had long been separated from the

north. The attempts to establish her independence in the time of Dagobert, Charles Martel, Pippin, Charlemagne, Charles the Bald, and Hugh Capet have been seen. It had a distinct language and peculiar customs. Commerce had brought comfort to the burghers and luxury to the barons; both exercising municipal functions in common without jealousy or hatred gave peace to the country. But in these rich cities, in these brilliant courts, enlivened by the songs of troubadours, religious doctrines were as lightly regarded as morals. Heresy penetrated everywhere. Pope Innocent III. organised against it the Inquisition, a tribunal charged with seeking out and judging heretics with the assistance of tortures, which burned innumerable victims without succeeding in stamping out heresy, because butchery is a poor means of securing the triumph of truth. The Inquisition having thus failed, the pope caused a crusade to be preached. The knights of the north of France, coarse and barbarous in comparison with those of the south, seized the occasion to avenge themselves of this odious superiority. They enrolled themselves in crowds in the hope of pillaging the rich cities of which they had heard such wonders. Simon de Montfort, a count in the neighbourhood of Paris, was their chief. The war was carried on without pity. At Beziers, 15,000 persons were slain, and the slaughter was committed everywhere else on the same scale. The powerful Count of Toulouse, the Viscounts of Narbonne and Beziers were despoiled (1209); the King of Aragon, who came to their help, was killed in the Battle of Muret (1213). The legate of the holy see offered the fiefs of the fallen to the powerful barons who had made this crusade. But they refused to accept that blood-stained property, and the legate presented it to Simon de Montfort and declared that the widows of heretics possessing noble fiefs might only marry "Frenchmen," the orthodox barons of the north, during the next ten years. The civilisation of the south perished, crushed by these rough hands. "The joyous science," as poetry was described by the troubadours, could no more be sung amid bloody ruins.

In their misery, the people of the *langue d'oc* remembered the King of France. Montpellier placed itself in his hands and Philip sent his son Louis to show them the banner of France. Louis returned a second time after the death of Simon de Montfort, who was killed before Toulouse; Amaury de Montfort, the son of the count, offered to cede to the king the conquests of his father which he could no longer defend in face of the universal

reprobation of his subjects. Philip, then on the brink of the grave, rejected this offer, which was accepted five years later.

English Expedition (1216).—On returning vanquished and humiliated to his island after the Battle of Bouvines, John found his barons in a state of rebellion. The whole of England was under arms; nobles, burghers, clergy, and laymen, exhibiting to feudal Europe a notable example of unity, forced the king to sign the great charter of English liberties (1215). John appealed to Pope Innocent III. who, on his own authority, declared the great charter to be invalid and released the king from his oath. John at once went to war against his barons, who called to their help the son of Philip Augustus, Louis, the husband of John's niece, Blanche of Castille. Innocent III. threatened Philip Augustus with excommunication, and the king pretended to attempt to check his son. But Louis answered, "Sire, I am your liege man for the territory which you gave me in France, but it is not for you to decide the fate of the kingdom of England." Accordingly, Louis persevered in his enterprise and, on May 30, 1216, landed in England, despite a papal excommunication. This sentence, which was becoming ineffective by dint of repetition, would not have prevented the French prince from succeeding had not the death of King John occurred. The latter left as his successor a child, Henry III. The barons realised that their cause would be better advanced by this child king than by a foreign prince who, after his victory, would doubtless be little disposed to respect their privileges, and who could, in time of need, be assisted by the forces of France. Louis was thus gradually abandoned and compelled to return to France in 1217.

Internal Administration.—Philip Augustus reigned with glory for forty-three years. The royal demesne was doubled by the acquisition of Vermandois, Amienois, Artois, Normandy, Maine, Anjou, Touraine, Poitou, and a part of Auvergne. The seventy-three *provostships* of which it was composed in 1223 were placed under the guardianship of *bailifs;* feudalism was attacked in one of its most ruinous privileges, the right of private war, by the establishment of the *quarantaine le roi*, an interval of forty days which must elapse between the suffering of an injury and the taking of private vengeance. Paris was beautified, paved, surrounded by walls, endowed with guildhalls, and superintended by a more efficient police; the Louvre was begun, the University of Paris established with great privileges, and the public records inaugurated. The authority of the court of peers was consecrated by a memorable example, the condemnation

of the King of England, and finally, monarchy became once more a legislative power and ordinances again became applicable to the whole state, a character which they had not possessed since the last capitulation of Charles the Simple. Such were the deeds of Philip Augustus. He had brought the monarchy beyond tutelage, to the great advantage of order, industry, and commerce which he encouraged, to the great profit both of the crown and of the people.

Relations between Philip and the Court of Rome.—But Philip underwent the censure of Rome. He married a second time Ingeburga of Denmark (1193), but on the day after the wedding he renounced her. A council of bishops pronounced the invalidity of this union, and Philip at once married Agnes of Meran, thereby causing a great scandal. A man, because he was king, trifled with the honour of a woman, a poor, defenceless stranger. Philip thought the sentence of the bishops would put an end to any discussion. But Ingeburga appealed to the pope, and Innocent III., in the name of outraged morals and religion, took up the cause of the woman whom all others had forsaken. Philip resisted. The pope cast an interdict over his kingdom. Everywhere services were stopped; the people died without prayers or consolations. In vain the king deprived those bishops who observed the interdict of their sees. He was obliged to bend before the universal discontent which threatened his crown; he put away Agnes of Meran, who died of grief, and took to him again Ingeburga in 1213. One of those great examples which Christianity alone has presented to mankind was thus afforded to the world.

Philip yielded and wisely; in another instance he resisted, wisely also. This was in 1203. He took possession of the fiefs which John had lost by his felony. Innocent III. threatened him with the anathema of the Church if he went further. Philip secured the co-operation of his great vassals and obtained from them a written promise to support him in this cause for all and against all, even against the lord pope. He then continued his enterprise.

On these two occasions the pope and the king in turn had appealed to public opinion with good reason; the former by interesting the people in the cause of morality, the latter by interesting the barons in the legitimate prerogatives of the crown. It was an advance indicating that France was emerging from the period when force reigned supreme.

In 1184, Philip Augustus caused the cathedral of Sens to be

rebuilt. The north tower still bears features of twelfth-century architecture. The second tower, begun in 1267, was not finished until 1535.

Louis VIII. (1223–1226): The South of France brought under the Authority of the King.—Philip Augustus died at Mantes on July 14, 1223, at the age of fifty-nine. The reign of his son was merely a continuation of his own. Louis VIII. had, one day during his father's lifetime, been proclaimed king in London by the English barons who were in revolt, and twice he crusaded against the Albigenses. On ascending the throne of France, he continued these two wars. From the English he conquered that part of Poitou which Philip Augustus had not permanently acquired, Aunis, Rochelle, Limoges, and Perigeux. In the *langue d'oc* he took Avignon. The country from the Rhône to within four leagues of Toulouse was subject to him; and he placed two seneschals or bailiffs at Beaucaire, Carcassonne, and Beziers. Thus, the whole of the south, west of the Rhône, with the exception of Guienne and Toulouse, recognised the royal authority. There were no longer two Frances; the work of territorial unity was progressing.

Louis VIII. died on his return from his southern expedition at the castle of Montpensier in Auvergne. He was thirty-nine years of age. He left in his will a hundred sous to each of the two thousand leper hospitals in France and twenty thousand pounds to two hundred town hospitals. He had, in 1224, liberated all the serfs in the fief of Étampes. These liberations increased until the time of Louis X., who declared that there should no longer be any serfs in France.

CHAPTER XXIV

ST. LOUIS (1226–1270)

St. Louis.—St. Louis was the true hero of the Middle Ages, a prince as pious as he was brave, who loved feudalism and who dealt it many wise blows; who reverenced the Church, and who could, when necessary, resist its head; who respected all rights, but above all followed the course of justice; who had a frank and gentle spirit, a loving heart filled with Christian charity, and condemned to torture the body of the sinner in order to save his soul; who, living on earth, yet gazed ever heavenward, and who rendered his kingly office a magistracy of order and

equity. He was canonised by Rome and the people still picture him seated beneath the oak of Vincennes dispensing justice to all comers. This saint, this man of peace, did more, in the simplicity of his heart, for the progress of monarchy than the most subtle councillors or ten warrior kings, because, after his reign, the king appeared to the people as the incarnation of order and justice.

Regency of Blanche of Castille (1226–1236).—For more than a century, the sword of royalty, which was that of France, was valiantly wielded. But the son of Louis VIII. was a child of eleven years. A coalition of great vassals was at once formed in order to profit from his minority. Fortunately the regent, his mother, Blanche of Castille, was both clever and courageous. She won over one of the confederates, Theobald, the powerful Count of Champagne; and then, with the royal army, delivered him from the attacks of his former allies. In recognition of this service she obtained from Theobald, who had inherited the kingdom of Navarre, the important counties of Blois, Chartres, and Sancerre. A treaty signed in 1229 secured to a brother of the king the inheritance of the Count of Toulouse, and a marriage arranged between the second brother of St. Louis and the heiress of Provence prepared the way to a subsequent union of that district with France. Already royal seneschals had been established at Beaucaire and Carcassonne, so that the king found himself master, in his own right or in that of his brothers, of a great portion of the south of France. The majority of St. Louis was proclaimed in 1236; but the wise regent retained the greatest influence on the mind of her son and in the management of affairs.

Private Crusade (1239).—The great pontificate of Innocent III. had given fresh energy to the Church and to religious feeling. The crusading spirit, which had been extinguished during the rivalry of Philip Augustus with Richard Cœur de Lion and John Lackland, had just reawakened. In 1235, the holy war was again preached in France, and, as happened too often, before starting for Jerusalem the expedition was inaugurated by the massacre of those whose fathers had nailed the Holy Victim to the cross on Golgotha. Everywhere the Jews were slaughtered; the Council of Tours was obliged to take these unfortunate people under its protection. The heretics were treated with less pity. Theobald, Count of Champagne, caused a hundred and eighty-three of them to be burnt at once on Mount Aime, near Vertus. Moreover, this crusade, which included

Theobald himself and the dukes of Burgundy and Brittany, met with little success. The crusaders were defeated at Gaza, in Palestine, and those who returned only brought with them the honour of having broken a few lances on holy ground.

Firmness of Louis IX. towards the Emperor and the Pope.— Until his war against the English, St. Louis did little of note. But in 1241, Emperor Frederic II., having detained some French prelates who had gone to Rome to attend a council, St. Louis firmly demanded that they should be set at liberty: "Because the prelates of our kingdom have for no reason deserved their detention," he wrote, "it will be expedient for Your Majesty to set them free; you will thus allay our anger; for we regard their detention as an insult, and royal majesty would lose its title to respect if we kept silence in such a case. . . . May your imperial prudence . . . not confine itself to alleging your power or your will, for the kingdom of France is not so weak as to resign herself to being trampled under foot by you." The emperor gave up his prisoners. Some time before that Louis had refused to receive for himself and for one of his brothers the imperial crown of Frederic II. which the pope offered him. He had also refused the request of the pope that he should modify a royal ordinance of 1234, which restrained the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical tribunals, a necessary measure, for those courts had come to judge many more civil cases than did the lay tribunals.

Victory of Taillebourg (1242): Treaties of 1258 and 1259.— This man, who spoke so firmly, acted in like manner when he was compelled to take up arms. Attacked in 1242 by the English, who had supported the revolt of some of his barons, St. Louis defeated them at Taillebourg and at Saintes. He might possibly have succeeded in expelling them from France; he refused to follow up his victory. The acquisitions made during the last half century had trebled the royal demesne, but it seemed to him tarnished with violence. It was the profit of two confiscations. Through conscientious scruples he left to the King of England, by virtue of a treaty which was not signed until 1259, on his return from the crusade, the duchy of Guienne, that is to say, Bordeaux, Limoges, Perigeux, Cahors, Agenais, Santonge (south of the Charente), and Gascony, in fief of the crown. In order to guard against perjury, he compelled the lords who held fiefs from both crowns to choose between the two sovereigns. The frontier was equally uncertain in the south. He fixed it by a treaty with the King of Aragon, and the county of Barcelona ceased to depend on the crown of France (1258).

Oecumenical Council of Lyons (1245).—In 1245 Pope Innocent IV., expelled from Italy by Emperor Frederic II., took refuge in Lyons and held in the great church of St. John, the cathedral of that town, the thirteenth oecumenical council, which was attended by one hundred and forty bishops. The pope there solemnly deposed the emperor and exhorted the Christian princes to march to the deliverance of the Holy Sepulchre. In the previous year, the Christians of Palestine had been crushed by the Charzimans at the Battle of Gaza, and Jerusalem had once more fallen into the hands of the infidels.

First Crusade of St. Louis (1248–1254): Joinville.—St. Louis had not awaited the call of the fathers of the council to take the cross. During a dangerous illness in 1244, he made a vow to go to the Holy Land. His mother and his advisers in vain opposed this imprudent resolve. Louis once more left all power in the hands of Queen Blanche and embarked at Aigues-Mortes, a little town which then, as to-day, communicated with the Mediterranean by a lake, and which the king had bought from the monks of the abbey of Psalmodi, in order to possess a port on that sea; for Marseilles belonged to his brother, the Count of Provence. A great number of crusaders embarked from the latter town, among others the seneschal of Champagne, a friend of the king, the Sieur of Joinville, who shares with Villehardouin the title of being the first and best of the early writers of French prose. It was not without some regret that he consented to follow his master. On leaving Marseilles he passed before his castle. "But," said he, "I did not dare to look towards Joinville for fear that I should be overcome by regret and that my heart would fail me for having left my two children and my beautiful castle of Joinville which is so dear to me." On the banks of the Rhône he saw a castle "which the king had caused to be razed to the ground in order to punish the sieur who had the evil reputation of despoiling and pillaging all the merchants and pilgrims who passed." Joinville gives with the most charming frankness an account of his embarkation and the terror with which the sea inspired him: "We entered the ship in the month of August of that year at the rock of Marseilles, and the door of the ship was opened to admit our horses, those which we were to take beyond the sea. And when all had entered the door was shut and closed up as would be sealed a butt of wine, for when the ship is on the open sea all the doors are under water. Then the ship's captain cried to his men who were at the beak (the prow) of the vessel, 'Is your

work done? Are we ready?' And they answered, 'Yes, truly.' And when the vicars and clergy had entered they were all sent up to the deck of the ship to sing to the name of God that we should have a safe voyage. And all in a loud voice began to sing this beautiful hymn, *Veni Creator Spiritus*, from beginning to end, and while singing the mariners set sail by God's will. And immediately the wind rushed into the sails, and presently we lost sight of land so that we saw nothing but sea and sky; and each day we drew farther from our starting-place. And for this reason I must say that any man was very foolish who, knowing that he had in his possession the property of others, or having some mortal sin on his conscience, yet placed himself in such danger. For if one slept at night, one knew not whether one would be in the morning at the bottom of the sea."

When, five centuries later, the soldiers of France followed on the same waters a great captain, each evening there gathered round him on board the *Orient* the generals and wise men whom he had brought, and by ingenious or learned discussions on science or letters charmed away the boredom of the long voyage. On board the vessel of St. Louis there was not so much learning; but there were conversations and debates, and the differences of time in no way appears so clearly as in the diverse prepossessions of the minds of these men of the two ages, these pilgrims of faith and science. "Seneschal," said the king one day, "what is God?" "Sire, He is the best and most supreme thing that can exist." "Truly that is well answered, for this reply is written in the booklet which I hold in my hand. I will ask you another question: which would you rather be, a leper and sordid, or one who has committed a mortal crime?" "And I," said Joinville, who would never lie, "answered him that I would rather have committed thirty mortal sins than be a leper. When the brethren had gone he called me to him alone, made me sit at his feet, and said to me, 'How dared you say what you said to me?' And I answered him that I would say it again. And he said to me, 'Ha, foolish trifler, you are wrong, for you know that no leper is so hideous as a mortal sinner. And I pray you first for love of God, then for love of me, to stifle that saying in your heart.'"

St. Louis had, during the previous two years, stored up a large stock of provisions in the Isle of Cyprus. The army started from thence in 1800 ships, great and small, for Egypt. Dalmietta, at one of the mouths of the Nile, was taken (June 7, 1249), but precious time was lost before marching on Cairo. A delay

of five and a half months restored the courage of the Mamelukes. The crusaders spent one month in covering the ten leagues which separated them from the town of Mansourah. A badly begun fight proved fatal to many knights and to the Count of Artois, brother of St. Louis. "When the chaplain of the hospital," said Joinville, "came to ask St. Louis if he wished for news of his brother, the king answered, 'Yes, indeed, I would know whether he knew that he would be in Paradise.' The priest attempted to comfort him and praised the valour which the prince had displayed and the glory which he had acquired that day; and the good king answered that God was adored by all He had made. And, in spite of himself, great tears began to flow from his eyes, filling many great men who saw it with grief and compassion." (February, 1250.) Soon the army was surrounded by the enemy and decimated by pestilence. Joinville was very ill and "likewise his poor priest. One day it happened, that when mass was being sung before the seneschal in bed, when the priest had reached the passage of the Sacrament, Joinville saw him looking so ill that he swooned away before his eyes." The seneschal rose and ran to support him; "and thus did he finish the celebration of the mass, and sang no more, but died." The crusaders were forced to surrender (April). "The good holy man, the king," honoured his captivity by his courage and inspired even his enemies with respect for his virtues. They gave him up for a heavy ransom. On obtaining his freedom he travelled to Palestine, where he remained three years, employing his influence and zeal in maintaining concord between the Christians and his resources in repairing the fortifications of those places which they still occupied.

Crusade of the Shepherds (1251).—The news of these disasters only increased the popularity of the King in France; the people were blind to his faults as a general and thought only of the virtues he had displayed. The prelates and lords abandoned and betrayed him. They said, "It is for the poor to deliver him"; and an innumerable crowd of serfs and peasants assembled to cross the sea and to go to the help of the king. It was the crusade of *Shepherds;* but these people lived on the route by pillage; murders were committed; it was necessary to treat them with rigour. They were hunted like wild beasts.

Return of Louis to France (1254).—The news of the death of the regent (December, 1252) at last recalled Louis to France. Passing near Cyprus the king's galley struck a rock "which carried off quite three fathoms of the keel." Louis was advised

to go on board another ship. "If I left the vessel," he said, "five or six hundred persons who are on this one, and who love their bodies as I do mine, would not dare to remain after me, but would land on the Isle of Cyprus and lose all hope or means of returning to their country. I would rather place the queen, myself, and my children in danger and in God's hands than do so much harm to so many people." (Joinville.)

Administration of St. Louis.—The Capetian monarchy had made so much progress that at this period no lord dared say to his vassals, "Come and fight under my banner against the lord king," although this anarchical right was still recognised even by St. Louis in his *Establishments*, or collection of laws written for his demesnes. The Counts of Flanders and Brittany and the Duke of Guienne were almost the only men who had not come down to the condition of submissive vassals; but feudalism still retained immense prerogatives. St. Louis attacked them in the name of justice and religion.

Obstacles placed in the Way of Private Wars and Judicial Duels.—Private wars were almost forbidden by the *establishment* of the *quarantine of the king*, which was also attributed to Philip Augustus, and by the *assurance* which one of the parties might claim from the adversary or the suzerain, which obliged him to submit the decision no longer to arms but to a tribunal. St. Louis as a Christian did not desire these wars which hurried to God so many souls unprepared to appear before Him. As prince, he wished to put an end to the devastation of the country, "fires and obstacles placed in the way of ploughing." He forbade in his demesnes *judiciary duels* on civil matters, which submitted the decision of right to the hazard of strength or skill. The justice of the king thus took the place of individual force, and evidence by witnesses and procedure by writ replaced the *battles of justice*, for "battle is not the path to right."

Appeals and Royal Cases.—The lords dispensed justice on their estates. If the *vilain* could not avoid judgment, the vassal possessed the right of appealing to the suzerain from the sentence of his lord: for *default of right*, when the lord refused to render justice; for *false judgment*, when the condemned person considered himself injured by an unjust sentence. Moreover, the king favoured the custom of appealing directly to his court, which subordinated seigniorial justice to his own. The Duke of Brittany alone preserved the final resort. When a case carried before a seigniorial justice interested the king, by whatever right it might be, the bailiff interposed and claimed the judgment

as the king could not be amenable to the tribunal of a lord. These were royal cases. It was easy to increase them; no opportunity was lost of depriving the lords of jurisdiction and adding to that of the king.

The Court of the King and Civilians.—Royal justice was originally dispensed by the principal vassals and the great officials of the crown, who formed the *king's court*. But this court, being now obliged to judge written procedures, was gradually deserted by ignorant barons and left by them to scholar judges and civilians supplied by the burghers. Thus the commoners entered the *king's court;* soon the parliament was composed almost entirely of them. It was until the revolution the head of the third estate and, as it were, a fortress from which were dealt all the blows against feudalism.

The King's Justice.—The sending of *commissaries*, or *royal inquisitors*, throughout the provinces, a custom revived from the time of Charlemagne, wise *ordonnances* on administration, the reform of coinage and the police of corporations and trades, prove how vivid and consistent was his solicitude for the common weal. Neither rank nor birth were an excuse to him. His brother, Charles of Anjou, having bought and taken possession of some property which the owner did not wish to part with, Louis obliged him to return it. The Sieur of Coucy, one of the most powerful lords of the realm, had caused three young men to be hanged for hunting offences. The whole baronage pleaded for him. Louis condemned him to an extremely heavy penalty. One lord cried ironically, "Had I been king, I should have hanged all the barons, for, the first step taken, the second step costs nothing." The king, hearing him, replied, "What, John, say you that I should hang all my barons? Certainly I shall not do that, but I shall punish them when they transgress."

This reputation of the equity of the good king was so well established that the English barons in revolt against their prince entreated Louis to arbitrate between them, an example followed by the Counts of Bar and Luxemburg. But as for the heretics, they no longer felt themselves bound to follow his decisions. "No one," said he, "except a great ecclesiastic or eminent theologian should dispute with the Jews, but a layman, when he hears evil spoken of the Christian faith, must defend it not only by words but with the good sharp sword, plunging it as far as it will penetrate into the bodies of the unbelievers." He punished blasphemers by causing their tongues to be pierced with a red-hot iron.

Pragmatic Sanction (1268).—The piety of Louis IX., which caused him to be ranked with the saints, did not prevent him from publishing the *pragmatic sanction*, the first foundation of the liberties of the Gallic Church as opposed to the holy see. In it the liberty of canonical elections was confirmed, and the impositions which the Church of Rome could levy on the churches of France were confined to urgent necessities; they could not be imposed without the consent of the king and the clergy.

Weakness of the Communes.—St. Louis liked to remember that during his minority, when pursued to the very walls of Paris by rebellious vassals, he had been saved by the militia of the city, who came out to his assistance. His relations with the towns were regulated by a strong spirit of justice. He confirmed many charters and corrected a few. But communal independence seemed to him no better than feudal independence, and he favoured the conversion of communes into royal towns, depending on and superintended by the supreme power, all possessing their own chief, chosen by them in free elections. An ordinance of 1256, directed communes to appoint four candidates from among whom the king chose the mayor, who every year was obliged to go to Paris to give an account of his financial administration. Finally, the principle was established that the king alone possessed the right of making communes and that all owed fealty to him, "against all persons, alive and dead."

Thus the communes were to disappear, and with them their proud sentiments, the great ideas of right and liberty cherished by the men who had founded or defended them; but the third estate was to begin.

Burghers of the King.—It was round royalty that this third estate was formed. By *appeals* and by *royal cases* the king had extended his jurisdiction to the midst of the greatest feudal masses. His influence penetrated in another way. By acknowledging himself a burgher of the king, a dweller on a seigniorial estate might exempt himself from the jurisdiction of his lord.

Commerce, Industry, Police.—The abolition of private wars and the ordinance of St. Louis, which rendered the lords responsible for the police on the roads in the seigniories, introduced a certain measure of security into the country. Another ordinance particularly favourable to commerce was that which gave currency to royal money throughout the whole of France. At Paris, St. Louis instituted the royal watch and ordered the provost, Stephen Boileau, to draw up the old rules of the hundred trades

which existed in that town, so as to bring peace and order into industry as he had brought it into the country. These trades were later gathered into great corporations; in the fifteenth century, all the merchants of Paris formed six bodies of arts and trades.

Last Crusade of St. Louis.—In the year 1270, St. Louis undertook a second crusade, in which his faithful Joinville refused to follow him. It was directed against Tunis. The king died of plague beneath the walls of the town with the greater part of his army. He wished to die on a bed of ashes. Not long before, in another illness which had brought him to the brink of the grave, he had called his son and said to him, "Dear son, I beg you to make yourself beloved by the people of your kingdom, for truly, I would rather that a Scot came from Scotland and governed the people well and loyally than that you governed them badly."

Conquest of Naples.—The French had made another great expedition under that prince without the co-operation of royalty. Charles of Anjou, Count of Provence, summoned by the pope against Manfred, son of Emperor Frederic II., had conquered the kingdom of Naples in 1266. But the Latins, five years earlier, had lost Constantinople which the Greeks had re-entered. The direction of the second crusade of St. Louis was determined by the interested advice of Charles of Anjou, for the submission of the Bey of Tunis would safeguard Sicily from the continual attacks of the Saracens.

St. Chapelle, Sorbonne.—St. Louis had founded the almshouse of Quinze-Vingts for the blind as well as several hospitals; he had built the chapel of Vincennes and St. Chapelle, which is still admired in Paris, near the Palais de Justice, formerly the palace of the king. The crown of thorns which the Venetians had given to him was preserved there. His confessor, Robert of Sorbon, founded the Sorbonne, which became a theological power so celebrated throughout Christendom that it was called by Mézeray "the permanent council of the Gauls."

CHAPTER XXV

THE CIVILISATION OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

Grandeur of the Thirteenth Century.—The thirteenth century was the most remarkable period in the Middle Ages. Two great popes, Innocent III. and Innocent IV., then occupied the chair of St. Peter, a saint was on the throne of France, and on that of the empire sat Frederic II., a prince who, in any period, would have concentrated universal attention on himself. The Investiture Controversy between Rome and the empire had ended, and Italy had for a time, though unfortunately not for ever, emancipated herself from that union with Germany by which her national development had been checked. England had laid the foundations of her political liberty; the Great Charter was drawn up; Parliament was founded. The crusading movement had been finally defeated, save in Spain, where the Christian kingdoms were no longer in any danger from the Mohammedans, but the effects of those great undertakings still dazzled all beholders. That vast movement of men had served to produce a vast movement in things material and in the human mind. Commerce, industry, letters, and the arts soared to unknown heights. Schools were multiplied; the sphere of learning was extended and national literature arose. Men of eminence flourished—Albert the Great, St. Thomas Aquinas, Roger Bacon, and Dante. Had it not been for the wars which followed, the Renaissance would have dated from the thirteenth century.

Strength of the French Monarchy.—In France, during the century and a half which followed the accession of the Capetian dynasty, vast changes occurred. At this time the king was the great revolutionary, as the aristocracy had been in the days before Hugh Capet, as the people were to be after the epoch of Louis XIV.

The monarchy which, in the time of Philip I., had been confined in four or five towns, utterly overthrew the obstacles which barred its progress and made rapid advances towards absolute power. The king's peace was imposed upon the turbulent vassals of the crown; the king's justice and the king's money were established and the crown legislated for all.

Formation of the Third Estate.—The revolution from above

found its counterpart in a revolution from below. The people who had been nothing became something. In the eleventh century the *manants*, finding no protector and experiencing oppression from every side, united in self-defence. They wrested the right of self-government from their lords, built walls and towers, organised a militia, and elected magistrates. For a century and a half they lived in this way, enjoying a violent independence, but at the same time suffering from isolation and being perpetually on their guard against attack, since they had as enemies not only their former lords who had not forgotten their rights, but also some neighbouring town which viewed them with jealousy. As the monarchy advanced towards absolute power it conceived a distrust for these hotbeds of free discussion and independence. The citizens themselves, very often dissatisfied with their republican institutions, which laid financial burdens upon them, and with their isolation, which placed them in danger, permitted the crown about the middle of the thirteenth century to intervene in their affairs and to order their finances. This intervention became daily more frequent and the communes gradually disappeared. In place of being citizens of a town the urban population became the king's burghers. France thus escaped the danger of becoming, like Italy, the seat of a thousand republics, and hence of falling a prey for many centuries to internal anarchy and external attack. From another point of view, however, this revolution was unfortunate, since it went too far and effected the suppression of those urban liberties by the medium of which the nation might have acquired that thorough political education which it has always lacked.

But the great movement which the communes had inaugurated was not interrupted. If no more charters of communes were granted, charters of enfranchisement were made. As early as the twelfth century, the serfs had already been permitted to bear witness in the courts of justice, and some of the popes, Adrian IV. and, above all, Alexander III., of whom a celebrated bull is still extant, had demanded liberty for them. By the thirteenth century, enfranchisement had become very frequent, for the lords began to realise the truth clearly expressed by Beaumanoir and by many charters that it would be to their advantage to have on their lands free men and hard working rather than to preserve those lazy serfs "who neglect to work, saying that they work only for another's gain."

Then, among the lowest class of the population a dual move-

ment was taking place which, by depriving some of their exclusive rights, and by delivering others from serfdom, tended to unite all the non-noble into a single class, the members of which possessed political solidarity. Of all the lands which had communes and serfs, France alone created a third estate.

The Lawyers and Roman Law: Opposition to Feudal Law.—This new class, of which Bishop Adelbero under King Robert had known nothing, came to its birth inspired by a spirit altogether contrary to that by which its progress had so long been opposed. While feudalism, which depended for its very existence upon privilege, granted everything to the eldest son and thus prevented the free circulation of real property, the burghers inscribed upon their charters, on the principles of the law of reason, the equal partition of property among all the children.

This new law of the people, humble and despised as it was, would have been unable to enter into a contest with aristocratic law had it not found a powerful auxiliary in the ancient code of the Roman emperors. Knowledge of the *Corpus Juris Civilis* had long been obscured, though not entirely lost, when in the eleventh and twelfth centuries it revived. Roman law was largely studied in various Italian cities and above all at Bologna, where numbers of scholars drawn from the whole of Europe thronged round the chair of Irnerius, the reviver of juridical study. The French were the first to pass the mountains to hear these learned lessons, becoming the pilgrims of knowledge as their fathers before them had been pilgrims of the cross. Montpellier, Angers, and Orleans soon had their chairs of Roman law. Under Philip Augustus the compilation of Justinian was translated into French, and such was the power of attraction possessed by this new form of study that popes' councils solemnly forbade monks to engage in it, that they might not be thus distracted from meditation upon the lives of the saints. In the eyes of the men of this time, bewildered as they were in the maze of feudal institutions, the Roman code, a wonderful example of logical deductions founded upon natural equity and the common good, appeared to be in very truth that which they described it as being, reason reduced to writing. The rich burghers devoted their sons to this study and thus formed an army to oppose the feudal system, and by means of these laws, rendered doubly respectable by their origin and their age, the lawyers were able in a thousand ways to work for the deliverance of the people from the two great forms of mediaeval servitude, servitude of the person and servitude of the land. St. Louis permitted

Languedoc to adopt Roman law as its municipal code; other provinces later obtained a similar concession. In those districts which preserved the original legal system, Roman law, held in reserve to be consulted on all doubtful cases, insensibly modified the spirit of ancient customs. Thus there began in the thirteenth century that arduous struggle between rational law, whether Roman or customary, and the aristocratic law of feudal society, a struggle which the lawyers maintained and directed and which ended only at the great epoch of 1789 in the triumph of equality over privilege.

The *manants* sought only freedom for their goods and persons, civil liberty. They did not yet desire that which has become known as political liberty, and the most advanced among them willingly accepted the further principle of Roman law, that all should be equal under a master. The Roman emperor had once been the living embodiment of the law, *lex animata*. The lawyers converted the king into the heir of the emperors, and on its side the monarchy drew from the ranks of these lawyers its secretaries, proctors, and provosts, who were to administer France gradually reunited.

Two powers thus stood face to face. On the one hand was the aristocracy, owning the soil and controlling the military force of the kingdom. On the other hand was the monarchy, supported by the third estate and advised by the lawyers in its attempt to regain all the power which it had lost and to reunite to the crown the former prerogatives of imperial authority. At the time of the death of St. Louis it was already possible to see the direction in which these two forces tended. The monarchy already appeared as the sole source of justice and authority, and the third estate was constantly growing in knowledge and in wealth, the factors to which it always owed its influence.

Commerce.—Prior to the crusades, the towns of Italy, Provence, and Catalonia were alone able to disregard distance; those of Germany and France kept constantly to the beaten track. During the twelfth century Troyes in Champagne, Beaucaire in Languedoc, and St. Denis near Paris held annual fairs which were renowned throughout the whole of Europe. The merchants of Rome, Orleans, Reims, and other towns brought thither the rich manufactures of Flanders and the immense stores of Bruges. The traders of Lyons, Nîmes, Avignon, and Marseilles went twice a year to bring from Alexandria the riches of the East, which also came to France by way of Venice and the towns of Germany. Bordeaux already exported her wine

to England and Flanders, while the towns of Languedoc purchased at Toledo finely tempered weapons and at Cordova highly ornamented Moorish work. Paris had a *hansa* or guild for merchandise coming to it by water, and Philip Augustus confirmed the privileges of this association. From it came the ship which still appears in the city arms. St. Louis took the merchants under his protection.

New Forms of Industry.—The crusaders also brought from the East various new forms of industry. The textile work of Damascus was imitated at Palermo and Milan, and the glass manufacture of Tyre was imitated at Venice, where the old mirrors of metal were replaced by mirrors of glass. Windmills, linen, silk, and various useful plants, such as the plum-tree of Damascus, became known in western Europe. Honey, which alone had been known in ancient times, was replaced by sugar cane, though it could only be cultivated in Sicily and Spain, whence it was later carried to Madeira and the Antilles. This is also the period of the introduction of the mulberry, by which first Italy and then France was enriched. Cotton fabrics now became common. Paper made from cotton had been known as early as the tenth or eleventh century; linen paper dates from the end of the thirteenth century, though it was not until the sixteenth century that it generally took the place of parchment. Damasks and the engraving of seals and coins were perfected, the art of enamelling became known, and the work of goldsmiths attained a hitherto unknown excellence.

Guilds.—During the last days of the Roman Empire workers of the same profession had formed associations. The barbarians in their turn introduced into the lands which they invaded the institution of guilds, all the members of which swore to maintain their union, placed themselves under the protection of some god or hero, and consecrated their association by festivals from which the members of the guild acquired the title of boon companions. The Roman and Teutonic institutions were assimilated, and from this assimilation originated the mediaeval guild. These guilds were protected by Charles the Great and forbidden by the synod of Rouen (1189); they were, however, far too necessary in those times of violence not to survive all prohibitions. The members of a guild secured mutual support and help for the old, for widows, and for orphans. Each guild had its patron saint, its festivals, and its common fund. The heads of the guild, the syndics or jurats, supervised the policing of the body, prevented fraud, and secured that the rules of the society should be ob-

served. These rules required a long and severe apprenticeship and assured to the members of the corporation the monopoly of their form of industry, with the result that in each profession the numbers of "masters" was fixed by that particular craft guild. The results were an interference with the fluidity of labour, since freedom to enter a given craft no longer existed, and the maintenance of high prices. This severe discipline, however, was necessary to nascent industry. Eventually the guilds became an abuse, but in the thirteenth century they gave the labourer security in his work; and it was from them that the bourgeoisie arose. The rules drawn up under the auspices of St. Louis for the guilds of Paris are still extant. The guild leaders had disciplinary power over their body, received a certain proportion of the guild revenues, and were even granted a measure of judicial power. They were, however, responsible to the provost for any disorders which might occur in their guild.

State of the Rural Districts: Lack of Security.—The guilds afforded a certain measure of security to urban industry, but agriculture had no such protection. The forests and moors were of vast extent, and it was only round the cities and walled towns, round the strong castles and monasteries, that highly cultivated land could be found, since the peasant did not dare to venture into the country far from any place of refuge. Crespy in Valois affords a curious example of the ordinary type of town of the period. It had a long suburb from which it was divided by a fortified line and the suburb itself was protected by an encircling palisade. The burghers lived in the town; the suburb served during the winter as a place of refuge for the peasants, their stock and their implements, and served a similar purpose at other seasons of the year when any danger threatened them. During their period of work in the country they had only huts such as the woodmen of the present day build in the great forests of France.

If the peasants were obliged to take such precautions, it is clear that they were still more necessary for the merchants. Beyond the tolls levied at the gates of every town, he was obliged also to buy a safe-conduct from every lord whose domains he traversed that he might be protected against robbery. Traders by sea had equally to submit to various exactions and especially to the horrible duty of wreck. When a shipwreck occurred the owner of the coast land appropriated everything that the sea cast up, even when the shipwrecked sailors reached the land with the cargo of the vessel that had

been lost. "I have here a stone more valuable than the diamonds which blaze in a royal crown," said a lord of Leon in Brittany, pointing to a rock famous for a number of shipwrecks which it had caused. And it was not unusual for the anger of the ocean to be aided by false signals which served to entice ships on to the rocks.

Attempts to Establish Security of Communications: Royal Money: The Jews and Bills of Exchange.—St. Louis revived a capitulary of Charles the Great which compelled the lords to keep up the roads and to guarantee safety to travellers from sunrise to sunset. In order to facilitate exchange, the same prince ordered that the money of the twenty-four lords who possessed the right of coinage should not be legal tender outside their estates and that, on the other hand, the king's money should be legal tender throughout the whole kingdom, an important step towards the abolition of seigniorial money.

As the Church forbade the taking of interest, usury abounded. The Jews alone were normally engaged in this form of industry since it was forbidden to the rest of the community, and this fact was one of the causes of the universal hatred which they aroused. It was the Jews also who, in order to realise their wealth and to facilitate its rapid circulation, invented bills of exchange, which annihilated the distance between the borrower and the lender, as steam has since destroyed the barrier of space between peoples.

Growth of Population.—The able government of Philip Augustus and St. Louis, which had recuperative effects, gave to mediaeval society that which it had hitherto lacked, a measure of order, peace, and security, and favoured to a remarkable extent the growth of population. Joinville bears witness to its considerable increase, and that increase is placed beyond all doubt when the great works accomplished during this period and the activity displayed in every direction are considered.

Universities.—There were few important abbeys to which a school was not attached, and the twelfth century witnessed the foundation within the limits of ancient Gaul of 702 new monasteries, the thirteenth century of 287. But the need of education had become so general that it was no longer satisfied by the monastic schools, and other schools were founded in all the large towns. Poverty and the great price of books made verbal instruction a necessity. Wherever a famous teacher fixed his chair, pupils assembled in crowds, but in the Middle Ages everything assumed a corporate form. At Paris, Angers, Orleans,

Toulouse, and Montpellier masters and disciples united and formed in each of those towns a body with extensive privileges under the name of a University. That of Paris received its statutes in 1215 from Philip Augustus; students flocked to it from every land, since Latin, the language of the schools, was in the Middle Ages the universal tongue. The university was divided into four faculties, those of theology, of the decretals or canon law, of medicine, and of the arts, of which the last included instruction in the trivium, grammar, rhetoric, and philosophy, and further in the quadrivium, arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy. Roman law was especially studied at Orleans, medicine at Montpellier. The faculty of arts elected the rector to whom the other faculties owed obedience.

Extensive privileges attracted students to these universities. That of Paris numbered from fifteen to twenty thousand scholars who were not under the authority of the city magistrates, might not be arrested for debt, and often disturbed the city by their feuds and debauches, though seven popes and a great number of cardinals and bishops came from their number during the thirteenth century alone. Since the fall of the Roman Empire knowledge had remained in the hands of the clergy and had been imparted only to the members of that caste; it was secularised by the universities. That of Paris, despite the fact that it was called "the eldest daughter of the kings" and "the citadel of the Catholic faith," nevertheless soon acquired a moral force so great throughout Christendom that kings and popes were compelled to reckon with it.

Scholasticism.—A child-like faith was characteristic of the Middle Ages, and it was long before the men of that period sought elsewhere than from theologians any solution to those great problems which disturb the soul when thought turns to the relationship between God and man. A spirit of inquiry, however, gradually revived, and at that moment philosophy, which had been silent for six centuries, revived also, though it possessed a peculiar character which has acquired for it a distinctive name, that of scholasticism.

In the eleventh century, St. Anselm, at the request of the monks of Bec, wrote his *Monologue*, in which he took as his thesis the bold supposition of an ignorant man seeking truth by the light of nature alone. In this tract, reason is no more than the handmaid of faith, since it was only with the object of establishing the religious verities that Anselm employed that reasoning which Aristotle had used to discover scientific truth. At a later

date the Spanish Jews translated from Arabic into Latin a large number of the works of Aristotle which had been unknown in the previous century, which possessed only some fragments of the *Organon*. The thirteenth century was overwhelmed by its possession of these new riches and the *Stagirite* reigned with undisputed authority in every seat of philosophy. Unfortunately, the enthusiastic study of Aristotle's works, which were only partially understood, had already warped the mediaeval intellect, turning it into a groove from which it only emerged with great difficulty. All knowledge was reduced to the art of reason ; an accurately constructed syllogism was regarded as proof. Scholasticism was thus not merely a certain system of philosophy or a mere set of views upon the great problems in which the human mind is interested. It was rather a particular method of discussing all questions, that discussion being based on certain premises which were unhesitatingly accepted or which were even taken as being axiomatic truths. As a result, scholasticism produced no ideas which might contribute to the advancement of mankind. It became a species of mental gymnastics in which the reward of effort was not the discovery of a truth, but a triumph won in some verbal conflict by the aid of subtle or ridiculous refinements and of a language which only the initiated could understand. Time and energy were wasted in these disputes, but the mind was exercised and developed in them and a weapon was forged for use in more serious conflicts.

The twelfth century was filled with great quarrels between Roscelin and St. Anselm, Abelard and William of Champeaux. The thirteenth century witnessed the lengthy debates of the Scotsman Duns Scotus and the Italian St. Thomas, both of whom studied and taught at Paris, both of whom gained a vast reputation, dividing between them the schools and Christendom and disturbing even the whole fourteenth century by the quarrels of their followers, the *Scotists* and the *Thomists*. They had been preceded in the University of Paris by the German Albert the Great, who was afterwards Bishop of Ratisbon, and whose learning secured for him the reputation of a magician.

Duns Scotus, St. Thomas Aquinas, and Albert the Great were all strangers to France by birth. After them may be mentioned Vincent of Beauvais, chaplain to St. Louis, not so much on account of the greatness of his intellect as for the interest which attaches to the encyclopaedia of contemporary knowledge, his *Speculum Majus*, a mediaeval parallel to Pliny's *Natural History*. It must, however, be added that until the thirteenth century

the Middle Ages lived among the ruins of antiquity without adding anything to them. Albert the Great began the revival of the art of observation, but invention appears only with Roger Bacon, an English monk, who also studied at Paris and who discovered, or at least explained in his writings, the composition of gunpowder, the nature of musical glasses, and the system of the air pump. He further recognised the need for a reform of the calendar, the changes which he suggested being exactly those which were ultimately adopted under Gregory XIII. Bacon died in 1294, after having spent many years in prison as a sorcerer and magician. It was also in Paris, "the city of philosophers," that the Spaniard Raymond Lull began to draw up his *Ars Magna*, a great but vain effort to produce a classification of the sciences and to construct a species of thinking machine which would have sterilised the intellect.

Astrology and Alchemy.—One of the products of the period was astrology, which became increasingly popular from this period until the sixteenth century and did not become extinct until the seventeenth century. The astrologers pretended to read in the stars the destiny of mankind. Human credulity was also exploited by the alchemists, who sought for the philosopher's stone, the means by which the baser metals might be transmuted into gold. Such idle researches, however, did produce some happy results. Astrologers, gazing persistently into the sky, were led to search out the laws which govern the movement of the heavenly bodies. The alchemists found no gold in their crucibles, but they did find new elements, or, as time went on, new properties of elements already known. To them mankind owes the discovery of the distillation of salts, acid solutions, enamelling, lenses from which spectacles are made, gunpowder, which the Arabs already knew, and the mariner's compass, which perhaps came from China.

Sorcerers.—We have noted the distortions of knowledge; mention must be made of the aberrations of the mind. Sorcerers abounded. Many of them believed sincerely that they were in relations with the devil, and a number of madmen who should have been medically treated were sent to the scaffold.

Literature : Development of the French Language.—One of the indications of the emergence of the French nation during the thirteenth century from the shadows of the Middle Ages is to be found in the fact that at this time its language finally freed itself from Latin forms and began to assume its true character. French became the medium of legislation; in it were drawn up the

Assizes or Laws of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. Villehardouin, the historian of the fourth crusade, and Joinville, the biographer of St. Louis, had already written in French and their works are still read. In 1275 a Venetian produced a chronicle of his land in French, excusing himself for so doing by saying that this language "is spread throughout the world and is more sweet to the ear than any other." Ten years later, Brunetto Latini, the master of Dante, wrote his *Trésor* in French, "because the French language is most generally known among all nations."

The Trouvères.—At the very moment when Paris, owing to the reputation of its university, attracted to it the most eminent scholars of all Christendom, the vulgar tongue which its professors despised extended its empire far beyond the frontiers of France. It may even be added that French genius, which has been so often accused of sterility in poetry, at that time flooded neighbouring lands with verse. The troubadours disappeared from the time when the Albigensian crusade drowned the civilisation of Languedoc in blood; no more were heard the virile accents of a Bernard de Ventadour or of a Bertrand de Borne, or the soft love songs of the Courts of Love. But north of the Loire, the trouvères still composed their *chansons de geste*, true epics which were translated or imitated in Italy, England, and Germany. It may therefore be justly said that in the thirteenth century France possessed incontestably the intellectual dominion of Europe.

The most famous of these trouvères were Robert Wace, "clerk of Caen," who about 1155 wrote the *Brut*, a legendary history of the kings of England; Christian of Troyes (about 1160), author of the *Chevalier au Lion;* Marie of France, whose lays, touching and romantic stories, are extant, as well as some lyric poems like those of Audefroy the Bastard, each incident in which is a little drama in itself; Count Quesnes of Béthune, one of the ancestors of Sully, who went on the fourth crusade and sang of it; Theobald, Count of Champagne, who in his verses succeeded in recovering the harmony which had been so characteristic of the poetry of the troubadours; and, finally, poor Rutebeuf, a contemporary of St. Louis, the earliest example of the professional poet whose profession, however, hardly enriched him, since he suffered both from cold and hunger, though in the midst of such misery he remained jovial, witty, and bold, writing on every subject in a free and vigorous style which anticipated the work of Villon.

Fables: The Romance of the Rose, etc.—Among the authors

of those fables and daring stories which old France loved so well, and in which the clerk and the noble were already treated with scant respect, the best known is Rutebeuf. These attacks are found in the famous poem of *Renard*, a satire on feudal society, and in the most popular work of the time, *The Romance of the Rose*, by William de Lorris, another contemporary of St. Louis, and Jehan de Meung, who did not die until 1320. They were not afraid to say to the nobles:—

> "Que leur corps ne vaut une pomme
> Plus que le corps d'un charretier."

They even spoke irreverently of the origin of royal authority:—

> "Un grand vilain entre eulx esleurent,
> Le plus corsu de quant qu'ils furent,
> Le plus ossu et le greigneur (le plus grand)
> Et le firent prince et seigneur.
> Cil jura que droit leur tiendroit
> Se chacun en droit soy luy livre
> Des biens dont il se puisse vivre" . . .

These daring words were called forth by the bitter hatred which smouldered in the hearts of the *manants* and which burst into flame with so much fury in the middle of the following century with the savage rising of the *Jacquerie*.

These bold satirists, however, must not be mistaken for early revolutionaries. They represent the press of that period, and their verses are but an echo of all the rumours of the day, of all the emotions of the mob. But their chief object was to jest and laugh. They even joked about that which they most respected, the Church, and that which inspired them with the greatest fear, hell. Curious instances may be given of this simple temerity, one of the best known of which is the *Vilain qui conquist Paradis par plait*, in which can be read that common sense and vague sentiment of equity which were later to raise the French peasants from their decadence. "A *vilain* died without either devil or angel being interested, but his soul, looking straight towards Heaven, saw the Archangel Michael conducting one of the elect, and followed him to Paradise. St. Peter, having allowed the elect to enter, repulsed the *vilain*, swearing by St. William since no one had recommended him. 'Good Sir Peter,' said the *vilain's* soul, 'God made a great mistake when He made you an apostle and afterwards His doorkeeper, when you denied Him three times. Allow one who is more loyal than you to pass.' St. Peter, much ashamed, complained to his friend, St. Thomas,

who in turn attempted to turn this rude fellow out of Paradise. The *vilain* made a new jest. 'Thomas,' he said, 'it is well for you to be so haughty, you who would not believe in God till you had touched His wounds.' St. Thomas had recourse to St. Paul, who learned another home truth by meddling in this matter. 'Was it not you, lord Paul the Bald, who stoned Stephen and to whom the good God gave a shrewd blow?' Peter, Thomas, and Paul, having nothing to answer, carried their complaints to God Himself, before Whom the accused, the serf, was delivered by his speech and justified himself, and the *vilain* gained his case before the divine justice." In time he was to gain his case also before human justice.

Villehardouin and Joinville.—The most important literary event of the thirteenth century was the appearance of French prose. But the first prose authors were not professional writers; they were two famous lords intimately concerned in the events which they recorded. Geoffrey de Villehardouin, Marshal of Champagne, has left the history of the fourth crusade, the *Conquest of Constantinople*, in which he took part. He wrote as a soldier, with a firm and crisp style, not without a certain military roughness. He hardly composes, writing straight on of assault after assault, with short exclamations on points which interest him. The Sieur de Joinville, also a native of Champagne, shows in his *Memoirs* of the seventh crusade more art of style and more refinement of mind. He observes, reflects, talks willingly on everything, giving his own opinions as well as recording the events of the war. He anticipates Froissart, with the difference that Joinville was qualified to be the adviser and friend of the pious and excellent St. Louis.

Arts: Pointed Architecture. — The thirteenth century is marked in the history of art by the triumph of pointed architecture. The rounded arch was now broken, made slighter and raised, to bear nearer to heaven the roof of the temple and the prayers of the people. It was at this time that those monuments of chiselled stone were built, the cathedrals of Paris, Rouen, Amiens, Chartres, Reims, Bourges, Strasburg, and the Sainte Chapelle of St. Louis at Paris, which replaced Roman architecture, still heavy and massive, by temples which show boldness of thought and all the elevation and fervour of religious sentiment. The new style, born north of the Loire, crossed the Channel, Rhine, and Alps, and colonies of French artists bore it to Canterbury, Utrecht, Milan, and even to Sweden. A heavy, though simple, statuary decorated the gateways, galleries,

cloisters, while painted glass produced magical effects in the windows by secret processes which are lost in modern times. Missals and books of the hours were adorned by paintings in miniature, many masterpieces of which are extant.

The Italian Cimabue, the master of Giotto, began at Florence during this period the restoration of painting. Music was still backward, and only in the fourteenth century did the Flemish masters begin a revolution in this art.

The Mendicant Orders.—The thirteenth century saw an important innovation in the Church, the creation of the mendicant orders. St. Benedict had promulgated, about 529, a monastic rule under which all the western monks were eventually included and this rule imposed labour of the hands and of the mind. The Benedictines united agriculture to preaching, the copying of manuscripts to prayer. Schools were generally joined to their convents and contributed to prevent the utter ruin of letters. The various religious orders which were successively founded remained more or less faithful to this idea, retaining always the imprint of Benedict. The order of the Franciscans, founded in 1215 by St. Francis of Assisi, and the order of the Dominicans, founded in 1216 at Toulouse by the Spaniard St. Dominic, had an entirely different character. The members of these two orders, removed from the jurisdiction of bishops and forming a militia devoted to the holy see, were bound to live on alms, to possess nothing, to go about the world to carry the Gospel everywhere where the too wealthy clergy would not carry it, to the midst of the poor, in the alleys and on the roads. The influence of these ardent preachers on the people and on the Church itself was immense. The Dominicans, who had received the special mission to convert the heretics, were invested in 1229 with the functions of inquisitors, but the tribunal of the Inquisition, though it appeared in France at the time of the Albigensian crusade, never took root or extended there as in Spain and Italy. The Dominicans bore the name of *Jacobins* in France, because their first convent was built in the Rue St. Jacques. The order of the Franciscans or Friars Minor gave birth to the *recollets*, *cordeliers*, and *capucins*. Duns Scotus, the subtle doctor, Raymond Lull, and Roger Bacon were Franciscans ; St. Thomas, the universal doctor, and Albert the Great were Dominicans. The Carmelites and Augustinians were of the same period and formed with the Franciscans and Dominicans the four mendicant orders. Austerity and piety exalted these new monks ; the learning of some of their doctors excited the emulation of the older monks

and the regular clergy. As a result ecclesiastical discipline was revived. But at the end of the following century, that discipline was again and more seriously impaired.

CHAPTER XXVI

PHILIP III. THE BOLD AND PHILIP IV. THE FAIR (1270–1314)

Philip III. (1270–1285) : Extension of the Royal Demesne.— Little is known of the reign of the eldest son of St. Louis, though that reign lasted for fifteen years. It began under the walls of Tunis, whence Philip transported the corpse of his father, having imposed a truce upon the Saracens, by which they became tributary to the King of Sicily and paid the cost of the expedition against them.

But it is possible to follow, during the reign of this prince, the constant development of monarchical power. Without any fresh internal conflict, but as the result of the extinction of various feudal houses, Valois, Poitou, the county of Toulouse, and the county of the Venaissin were added to the royal demesne, though Philip III. ceded the last-named fief and half Avignon to the pope. The Count of Foix, defeated and taken prisoner in his capital, was compelled to swear faithful service and to surrender part of his lands. The rule of the King of France was thus extended to the Pyrenees, and it even crossed the mountains. Philip married his son to the heiress of the kingdom of Navarre, and though he failed to secure the throne of Castille for a prince under his own influence, and failed also to place the crown of Aragon on the head of his second son Charles, yet he displayed his arms in Catalonia, where he took the strong place of Gerona. Thus the Capetian dynasty, triumphant within the limits of its own territory, already made trial of its fortune in foreign lands. That trial was made prematurely, since the first part of the dynasty's work was not accomplished, and its accomplishment was a necessary prelude to the undertaking of the second portion of its mission.

The expedition into Catalonia, the result of which was unfortunate, originated only from family interest. Philip was anxious to punish Don Pedro, King of Aragon, for the support which he had afforded to the Sicilians in their revolt against Charles of Anjou, after the massacre of all the French in the island. This

massacre occurred during Vespers on Easter Monday, and is therefore known as the Sicilian Vespers (1282).

An ordinance of Philip III. compelled advocates in the royal courts, whose status was regulated in 1274, to swear each year that they would only undertake the defence of just causes. The first example of a commoner ennobled by the king is afforded by the case of Raoul, Philip III.'s silversmith, to whom letters of nobility were accorded in 1272.

Philip IV. (1285–1314): Wars of Guienne and Flanders.—Philip IV., surnamed the Fair, was only seventeen when he succeeded his father (1285). He freed himself as rapidly as possible, by treaties, from the useless wars in which his father had engaged, and applied himself to the far more useful task of increasing his demesne by acquisitions nearer home. His marriage with the heiress of Navarre and Champagne had already been worth two valuable provinces to him. A sentence of the parliament despoiled the heirs of Hugh of Lusignan of their territories La Marche and Angoumois and gave them to the king. Finally his second son married the heiress of Franche-Comté. Thus, by means of marriages, escheats, and conquest, all France was gradually being absorbed into the royal demesne. But some powerful vassals still remained, the Duke of Brittany, the Count of Flanders, and, above all, the Duke of Guienne. Philip at once attacked this last, a formidable adversary, since he was also King of England. Fortunately for the Capetian, Edward I., who was engaged in the conquest of Wales and the attempted absorption of Scotland, was too fully occupied in his own island to cross to the continent. The French army was able to make rapid progress in Guienne; a French fleet even sacked Dover; and another army, led by the king in person, entered Flanders, where the count had declared himself in favour of England, and defeated the Flemings at Furnes (1297). The mediation of Pope Boniface VIII. effected a peace between the two kings, which was sealed by a marriage, a daughter of Philip IV. wedding Edward I.'s son, and thus bringing to the English royal house those claims to the French throne which Edward III. was soon to assert (1299).

War of Flanders.—As a result of this peace the two kings sacrificed their allies, Philip the Scots and Edward the Flemings. The Count of Flanders, in alarm, submitted to Philip and his territory was reunited to the demesne (1300).

The whole court paid a visit to the new conquest. It was received with great pomp; the Flemings, to do honour to their

noble guests, dressed themselves in their finest clothes and displayed all their wealth. The entry into Bruges was especially magnificent. The wives of the burghers exhibited so much gold and so many jewels in their dress that the French queen was wounded in her woman's vanity. " I believed," she cried, " that there was one Queen of France : I see six hundred." Flanders was in fact the wealthiest country in Europe, since its people were the most industrious. In that fertile land population had increased rapidly ; towns were numerous, their inhabitants active, hardworking, and devoted to England, whence they secured the wool needed for their manufactures, as the towns of Guienne, especially Bordeaux, were devoted to the English, because England bought their wine. Flemish cloth was sold throughout Christendom, being found even at Constantinople, and the cities of the Low Countries were the market at which the goods of the North, coming from the Baltic, were exchanged for those of the South coming from Italy and Venice by way of the Rhine.

On a soil which had been drained only by the cutting of numberless canals, among numerous cities defended by their walls and by citizens accustomed to toil but yet proud of their numbers, strength, and riches, chivalry could not flourish and feudalism had little hold on Flanders. All the towns had their privileges ; to attempt to infringe them was dangerous.

Financial Embarrassment of Philip IV.: Change in the Coinage. —The French monarchy, under Philip the Fair, was in a transitional stage, which compelled it to act in a vexatious and oppressive manner. In feudal times, the crown had no ministers to pay, since administration was unknown; no army to maintain, because the vassals were obliged to serve gratuitously. Those days had passed away. The royal demesne included, instead of merely four or five towns, two-thirds of France ; it needed bailiffs, seneschals, provosts to maintain order and execute the laws, registrars to place its acts on record, judges to administer the laws, and councillors so carry on the work of government. The first six Capetians did not formulate a single general ordinance ; a considerable number, dating from the one reign of Philip the Fair, are still extant. But all these officials required payment for their work. Wars were now carried on, not at some short distance, but in the Pyrenees, on the Garonne, and on the Scheldt. Where there had been a mere battle there was now a campaign. The feudal host was no longer sufficient. To keep his army with his standard for a period longer than that prescribed

by the condition of tenure, the king offered payment, and in case of need also enrolled mercenaries, whose loyalty was more dependable and whose service was more defined. For the Flemish war a fleet had been necessary, and to the ships of Poitou and Normandy Philip added sixteen Genoese galleys, for which he had to pay heavily. The King of England on one occasion sent 10,000 pounds sterling to the emperor, a similar amount to the Count of Gueldres, and almost twice as much to the Duke of Brabant, and a vast coalition was thus formed against France; the livres of Tours were called upon to undo the work accomplished by the pounds sterling.

With the progress of industry, commerce, and art, luxury developed and life, especially at the court, became more expensive. Expenses increased daily while the revenue remained stationary, and became constantly less adequate. Philip the Fair, always in need of money, was compelled to have recourse to every expedient by which he might augment his resources, and as the science of finance is a modern creation, the expedients employed were ruinous for the people, without benefiting the government to any considerable extent. Thus, when he robbed the Jews and the Lombards, the bankers of the period, he caused a dearth of coin; when he debased the coinage he rendered commerce impossible; when he promulgated sumptuary laws he ruined industry. He imposed taxes on the Flemings and they revolted; on the clergy and thus embittered his quarrel with Boniface VIII. He destroyed the Order of Knights Templars in order to appropriate their wealth, and thus left a bloody memory behind him. Only one of his financial expedients was praiseworthy: he sold their freedom to the majority of the serfs on his demesne and commuted their dues for money payments.

These characteristics are not peculiar to the reign of Philip the Fair; they explain the whole fourteenth century. Every king debased the coinage, because every king was in need of money and knew no other means by which it might be procured, though this fact excuses neither the fraud, nor the exactions, nor the violence of which kings at this period were guilty. To escape a difficulty by resort to dishonest expedients is to cease to govern, and despite the explanations which can be supplied of his conduct, Philip IV. thoroughly deserved his unsavoury reputation.

New War of Flanders (1302–1304): Battle of Courtrai (1302). —Philip had appointed Jacques de Châtillon governor of

Flanders, a man who believed it to be needless to conciliate a conquered people, especially a conquered people possessed of so much wealth. The Flemings, little tolerant and accustomed to greater prudence in their counts, revolted, and in Bruges alone three thousand Frenchmen were massacred. Philip sent Robert of Artois with a numerous army to avenge this injury. Twenty thousand Flemings boldly awaited the advance of the chivalry near Courtrai, behind the canal. Before the battle the burghers confessed their sins, and their priests celebrated a solemn mass ; all knelt and taking some of the earth, put it to their mouths, swearing to fight to the death for the liberties of their land. The meditation of a whole army is usually of ill augury for its opponents. The French advanced without order, assured that they were about to conquer and not doing their low-born opponents the honour of supposing that they would dare to face the nobility of France. In vain the Constable Raoul de Nesle urged prudence ; he was asked if he was afraid. " Sire," he answered Count Robert, " if you follow where I lead, you will be well in the forefront of the fight." And he jumped quickly on his horse, urging it forward. No care had been taken to reconnoitre the position of the Flemings. The first ranks of the dense column of knights were engulfed in the canal which covered the enemy's line. Those in front, pressed forward by those behind, were overthrown, and the Flemings had only to run their long lances into this mass of men and horses to kill them without risk to themselves. A sortie which they made from the two ends of the canal completed the rout ; two hundred lords of high birth and 6000 men-at-arms perished. The most shameful incident of the day was the fact that the Duke of Burgundy, the Counts of St. Pol and Clermont, and 2000 lances fled, leaving the constable, the Count of Artois, and many noble warriors to be beaten, cut off, and killed by the hands of bondsmen.

The Battle of Mansourah had already displayed the undisciplined temper and military inexperience of the knights, but it had occurred in the East and distance had thrown a glamour over the defeated side. The Battle of Courtrai, lost by the flower of chivalry to bondsmen, caused a notable sensation, though it did not cure the nobles of their rash presumption. The defeats of Crecy, Poitiers, and Agincourt were the result of the same causes which produced the disaster of Courtrai. The feudal nobility, despoiled of its privileges by the crown, lost on these battlefields the prestige by which it had been so long surrounded,

and saw, to complete its ruin, another army, that of the king and the people, rise by its side.

Battle of Mons-en-Puelle (1304).—Philip the Fair took energetic measures to repair the disaster of Courtrai. He compelled nobles and burghers to bring their gold and silver vessels to the royal treasury, paying them in his debased coinage. He ordered that all land of the value of a hundred livres should supply a knight, that every hundred bondsmen should supply six foot soldiers, and that every commoner having twenty-five livres income should serve in person. He sold freedom to many serfs, nobility to many commoners. In these ways, and in two months, he revived the strength of the kingdom, and it was considerable; that of the burghers was greater still, and the cities of Flanders put 80,000 combatants in the field. With such forces arrayed on either side, the struggle would have been both terrible and decisive; the fact was realised and, as there was no wish to run great risks, the year (1302) passed while the two parties merely watched one another. Philip was then at the most critical stage of his quarrel with Boniface VIII., and a fresh reverse would have been fatal to him. In the following year (1303), he even permitted the Flemings to take the offensive. But the pope died, and forthwith Philip attacked the Flemings by land and sea (1304). His fleet gained a victory near Zirickzee, and at Mons-en-Puelle he revenged the reverse of Courtrai. He thought that the Flemings were crushed, but in a short time they appeared in sufficient numbers to offer a new battle. "It rains Flemings," cried the king, and preferred to treat rather than to fight. He was promised money; Douai, Lille, Béthune, and Orchies, with all Walloon Flanders, the French-speaking district between the Lys and the Scheldt, was ceded to him. On these terms, he restored their count to them, with a mere promise of feudal homage. The French monarchy thus fell back before Flemish democracy, as monarchy in Germany, at almost the same time, fell back before Swiss democracy. The French communes, remaining divided, fell; in Flanders and in Switzerland the communes united and triumphed.

Quarrel with Boniface VIII.—The quarrel between Philip the Fair and Boniface VIII. began in 1296 on the question of the taxes which the king imposed upon the French churches. In the following year peace appeared to be restored and Boniface sealed his reconciliation with the French crown by canonising St. Louis. But the dispute presently revived as a result of the pope's haughty interference with the internal affairs of the kingdom. One of

his legates, Bernard Saisset, Bishop of Pamiers, braved the king to his face. The days of Gregory VII. had passed; the king caused the bishop to be arrested on the ground that he had plotted against royal authority, and required his metropolitan, the Archbishop of Narbonne, to inflict canonical degradation upon him. The archbishop referred the matter to the pope who threatened to excommunicate the king for having dared to lay hands on a bishop. At the same time, Boniface launched his bull, *Ausculta, fili*, in which he reproached the king with having burdened his people, clerk and lay, with cruel exactions; with having encroached upon ecclesiastical jurisdiction; with having destroyed the effect of episcopal sentences; and with having devoured the revenues of the churches when vacant by abusing his regalian right. At the same time, the pope allowed his claim to appear, that there was in the realm a second power beside that of the crown, the power of the holy see. "God," said Boniface, "has appointed us, unworthy as we are, over kings and over kingdoms, to destroy them, to overthrow them, to disperse, edify, and plant them in His name and by means of His doctrine. Let no one persuade you that you have no superior and that you are not subject to the head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. He who thinks such thoughts is a madman; he who supports such doctrines is an infidel."

The attack of the pope on the maladministration of Philip was well-founded, but neither king nor pope had any clear idea as to the bounds of the temporal authority of the former and of the spiritual authority of the latter. All wrong acts being sinful, the pope believed that he had the right to judge and to punish with the thunders of the Church the blameworthy acts of the prince, and the prince, on his side, guided by the lawyers, who, following the spirit of the civil law, assigned absolute power to the king, believed that he had the right to interfere with the administration of the churches and wished the bishops, like the rest of his subjects, to be subjected to his officials and to his tribunals. These conflicting claims produced a deplorable quarrel. Philip declared in a plenary court that he would renounce his children as his heirs if they humbled themselves to recognise any other power except God as being superior to themselves in temporal affairs. He caused the papal bull to be burned publicly (February 11, 1302), and to win the nation to his side in the great quarrel, he summoned to him the deputies of the States-General, divided into the three orders, clergy, nobles, and bourgeoisie or third estate (April 10, 1302). "To

you, most noble prince," said the deputies of the third estate, "to you our lord Philip, the people of your realm make prayer and demand that you preserve the free sovereignty of this state, which is such that you shall recognise no sovereign in these lands in temporal matters save God." Thus the first words uttered by the people in France were a cry of national independence.

The king assembled them again in the following year, and, trusting in the strong support which he received from these representatives of the country, he pursued the struggle to the bitter end. The pope was threatened with a general council, before which Philip proposed to accuse him, and on his side prepared a bull declaring the deposition of the king. Philip had foreseen this move. William de Nogaret, one of his agents, whose grandfather had been burned as an Albigense, entered Italy and effected an understanding with Sciarra Colonna, a Roman noble and the pope's deadly foe. Boniface was then at his native place of Anagni. By means of bribery, Nogaret won over the commander of the militia of the town, and one morning entered the place at the head of four hundred men-at-arms and some hundreds of infantry. Hearing the noise which they made in the town, and the cries, "Death to the pope! Long live the King of France!" Boniface believed that his last hour had come. The vigorous old man, despite his eighty-six years, showed no sign of weakness. He put on the pontifical robes, seated himself on his throne, the tiara on his head, his cross in one hand and the keys of St. Peter in the other, and thus awaited the murderers. They called on him to abdicate. "Here is my breast, here is my head," he answered. "Betrayed, as was Jesus Christ, if it must be that I die as He died, at least I will die pope." Sciarra Colonna tore him from his throne, struck him in the face with his gauntlet, and would have killed him, if Nogaret had not prevented it. "Caitiff pope," cried the grandson of the Albigense, "think and take notice of the goodness of my master, the King of France, who, far as his realm is from you, guards and defends you by my hand."

Death of Boniface VIII. (1304): Election of Clement V. (1305).—Nogaret hesitated to remove the old man from Anagni, and so left the people time to recover from their stupefaction. The citizens armed and the peasants hastened in from the neighbouring districts; the French were expelled from the town. The pope, fearing that poison would be mixed with his food, had remained three days without eating. Shortly afterwards, he died of shame and anger at the insults to which he had been subjected.

His successor, Benedict XI., attempted to avenge him by excommunicating Nogaret, Colonna, and all who had aided them, the excommunication also touching the king in this way. A month after publishing this bull, Benedict was found poisoned. On this occasion Philip took steps to make himself master of the new papal election. Bertrand de Goth, Archbishop of Bordeaux, was designated for the papal chair, having promised to comply with all the king's wishes. He took the name of Clement V., was consecrated at Lyons, and abandoning Rome, established himself in 1308 at Avignon, a possession of the holy see beyond the Alps, where, however, he found himself in the power and under the control of the King of France. His successors remained there until 1376, and this residence of the popes at Avignon, which weakened the papacy, was known as the Babylonian Captivity.

Condemnation of the Templars (1307).—When Philip offered the papacy to the Archbishop of Bordeaux, he imposed his own terms upon him. One of the conditions exacted was nothing less than the destruction of the military Order of the Templars. The wealth of these monastic warriors, useless since it was no longer expended in arming against the infidels, attracted the cupidity of the king, always in need of money, and their power was offensive to his despotic temper. They numbered 15,000 knights, with an unknown number of serving brothers and novices; so that, if united in one host, they could have defied all the royal armies in Europe. They held in Christendom more than 10,000 manors and a number of fortresses, including that of the Temple in Paris, where Philip had found a safe refuge during a riot which broke its force in vain against those thick walls. In the treasury of the Order there were 150,000 gold florins, in addition to silver coins and precious vessels. A strict organisation, by which the knights were kept under the control of the grand master, made the body even more formidable than it was by reason of its valour and wealth. No one knew what passed in the halls of the Order; all was secret, and no profane eye had ever beheld its mysteries. But vague report told of orgies, scandals, impiety. Some knights had disappeared because, it was said, they had threatened to make compromising revelations. The pride of the Templars angered the people and odious crimes were charged to their account. They were guilty only of a great relaxation of discipline, while their religious ceremonies had probably been infected in the East with unorthodox ideas and bizarre customs.

On September 14, 1307, all the seneschals and bailiffs of the

kingdom were warned to hold themselves ready and armed for October 12; at the same time they received sealed letters, which they were not to open under pain of death until the night of October 12–13. The knights were taken by surprise and had time neither to resist nor to concert their defence. Torture, as usual, extracted confessions from its victims. Philip wished to unite the nation with himself in this great trial, as he had united it with him in his quarrel with Boniface VIII. The States-General assembled at Tours; the charges against the knights and their confessions were produced before the deputies, who declared that the accused were worthy of death. Provincial councils reinforced this condemnation, and the Council of Paris caused forty-five Templars who had retracted the confessions made under torture to be burned in one day at a slow fire in the Faubourg St. Antoine. Nine were burned at Senlis and there were certainly other executions. At the Council of Vienne, the pope pronounced the dissolution of the Order throughout Christendom. Its great possessions were transferred to the Knights Hospitaller, or Knights of Rhodes. But the royal treasury did not so easily relinquish what it had seized. All the money found in the Temple, two-thirds of the movables, and all outstanding debts, with a large number of estates, remained in the hands of the king. In Italy, England, Spain, and Germany the Order of the Temple was abolished and its goods partially confiscated by the kings. Executions occurred only in France.

Heresies.—The Council of Vienne also condemned many errors which had appeared in the ranks of the Franciscans. Among these were the *Spiritualists*, who held that St. Francis was a new incarnation of Jesus; the *Beggars*, who regarded man as absolved from all obedience to human law when rendered perfect by conversion; the *Fraticelli*, who held that private property should be abolished and declared that all things should be common, families no less than goods. These wild doctrines were very old. A *Beggar* was burned in the Place de Grève in 1313.

Last Years of Philip the Fair.—The last years of this reign were even more gloomy than those which preceded them. After six years, the great dignitaries of the Order of the Temple seemed to lie forgotten in their prisons. In 1313 they were brought out, appeared before a papal commission, and were condemned to be imprisoned for the rest of their days. But the grand master, Jacques Molay, and another dignitary at this time withdrew their confessions, to the great alarm of the commission, which thought that the terrible affair was at last ended. While the

commissioners deliberated, Philip caused the two Templars to be seized; a scaffold was hastily erected where the statue of Henry IV. now stands near the Pont Neuf, and the two victims were burned (March 11). A popular legend grew up concerning their death: that the grand master, from his scaffold, adjured his executioners to appear with him before God, the pope in four months, and the king in a year.

Bloody tragedies occurred even in the heart of the king's family. His three daughters-in-law, accused of indecent conduct, were arrested and placed in strict confinement. One, Margaret of Burgundy, imprisoned at Château-Gaillard, was afterwards strangled; another died of a broken heart; and the third was taken back by her husband. Their accomplices, Philip and Walter d'Aulnay, were burned alive on the Place de Grève, and many other nobles and commoners were tortured, sewn up in sacks, and hurled into the river.

Meanwhile popular anger increased against a government which debased the coinage and forbade, under pain of death and forfeiture, the importation of foreign money or the assaying of the royal money, the latter prohibition being intended to prevent the discovery of its real value by detecting the amount of alloy. As these changes in the coinage did not suffice to satisfy the needs of the treasury, a tithe was levied on the clergy under pretence of a crusade; the king exacted aids from his vassals for the knighting of his sons and for the marriage of his daughter with the English king, and further imposed arbitrary imposts, *male-toltes*, on the whole community. Popular anger found vent in murmurs; the murmurs were embittered by executions. The universal oppression led to an actual revolt when Philip established a new tax on the sale of all commodities. A league between the nobles and the commons was foreshadowed, similar to that which in England laid the foundation of public liberty and wrested Magna Carta from John Lackland. Philip gave way. The impost was abandoned; the deputies of forty good towns were summoned to Paris to consult with the king, and were promised that henceforth only good money should be coined.

But this sinister man, the hardest king who had yet ruled in France, died at the early age of forty-six (November 29, 1314).

Territorial Gains.—During this reign some important territorial gains were made, all of which, however, were not permanent. The counties of La Marche, Angoumois, Champagne, Franche-Comté and Lectoure, part of Flanders (Lille, Douai,

and Orchies), Quercy, the great city of Lyons, and part of Montpellier were annexed. The Count of Bar was compelled to do homage to the French crown for all the lands which he held west of the Meuse.

The Parliament.—Vassals were compelled to serve their lord in his court in the giving of council and in the administration of justice. The feudal court had these two characteristics; the king sought from his barons advice and sentence. As the power of the crown increased, the functions of the royal court developed. It became necessary to effect a differentiation of duties, and thus there arose the political court or great council and the judicial court or parliament. Under St. Louis, the character of the latter body was still not clearly defined. Philip the Fair effected its organisation. He ordered it to meet at Paris twice a year for a session of two months in the Palace of La Cité which later acquired the name of the Palais de Justice (1302). This sovereign court of justice, which claimed to have jurisdiction over the whole kingdom, was destined to become the great instrument by means of which the kings reduced all France under their absolute authority. Philip also established two exchequers at Rouen and two *grands jours*, judicial commissions, at Troyes; but over these provincial courts there presided commissaries drawn from the parliament. The institution of the public ministry or magistrates, employed to defend in all cases the rights of the crown and of society, appears to date from this reign.

Chamber of Accounts.—As Philip had drawn the parliament from the great council or royal court, so he drew from the parliament the chamber of accounts, which was at first part of the parliament, but later became distinct from it. There were thus three main bodies dealing with the administration of the realm: for justice, the parliament; for finance, the chamber of accounts; and for policy, the great council or privy council.

Ordinances of Philip IV.—The numerous ordinances of Philip IV. which are still extant show his activity in organising that new administration which the crown was compelled to give the kingdom since it had usurped the place once occupied by the feudal lords. If these laws are often marked by a despotic and fiscal spirit, some show a true sense of government. One ordinance forbade private wars and trial by battle during the times at which the king was at war, and the effect was to disarm feudalism. Another (1313) forbade lords to coin money, and in the following year the deputies of the towns demanded from the king that this prohibition should be maintained for eleven years.

It was decided, in conformity with an example already given by St. Louis, that an appanage or lands ceded by the king to one of his sons should revert to the crown in default of male heirs, a method by which the unfortunate results of the great grants made to members of the royal house might to some extent be avoided. The Capetians did not partition the kingdom as the Merovingians had done, but the partitioning of the royal demesne occurred, with the result that these kings pulled down with one hand that which they built with the other, striking down the older feudalism to replace it with a new feudalism in the fiefs which they granted to their sons. An ordinance of 1298 abolished all personal servitude in the seneschalries of Toulouse and the Albigeois in return for a small annual money payment.

Finances.—Attention has been drawn to the financial embarrassments of Philip the Fair and to the expedients which he adopted to raise revenue, the debasement of the coinage and confiscations. He did more in creating the *douanes* on the frontiers, by which he struck at the exportation of commodities, and in levying new imposts. Hitherto the king had been possessed of no regular revenues other than those of his demesne lands. Vassals and subjects paid *aides*, *taille*, and *gabelles* (excise duties) only in certain defined circumstances. The constant wars of Philip IV. made these taxes permanent, since he required to be *aided* now against the English, now against the Flemings. But since, under the feudal system, these *aides gracieuses* or *droits de complaisance*, as such voluntary gifts were called, could be levied only with consent, the king was forced to assemble meetings of provosts, bailies, or even of the whole realm. These assemblies gave rise to the provincial states and to the States-General.

First States-General (1302).—The most important event in the administration of Philip the Fair was the summoning (1302) of the first States-General, composed of deputies of the three orders, clergy, nobles, and commons. It was thus the most despotic of French kings who revealed to the people their rights and their destiny. Rendered anxious in the face of a great danger, and ruined by his constant activities, he was driven to call round him the deputies of the nation, to gain from them the help which he needed, and to protect himself against the pope by the assent of France. But by discussing with them the prerogatives of the crown and of the tiara, he recognised by implication the old right of national sovereignty which had been so thoroughly obscured and forgotten for centuries. Philip IV.

doubtless sought only to secure needed help. But the men who in 1302 fought for the king against the pope, and who in 1317 disposed of the crown, were emboldened at a later date to lay hands on the crown itself.

CHAPTER XXVII

THE THREE SONS OF PHILIP THE FAIR (1314–1328)

Louis X. (1314–1316).—Three sons of Philip the Fair reigned in succession, Louis X. *le Hutin* (the burly) or *le Quereleur* (the quarreller) (1314–1316), Philip V. the Tall (1316–1322), and Charles IV. the Fair (1322–1328). The first of these princes only wore the crown for eighteen months and only three events are associated with his reign, the murder of Margaret of Burgundy, whose husband caused her to be strangled at Château-Gaillard; an expedition against Flanders which ended in failure, since the French did not advance beyond Courtrai and almost their whole army perished in the Flemish mud; and finally a vigorous recrudescence of feudalism which overthrew the advisers of Philip IV. and attempted to undo the work of that king. Enguerrand de Marigny, the late king's finance minister, was hanged at Montfaucon, on a gibbet which he had himself constructed. Peter de Latilly, chancellor of France, and Raoul de Presle, advocate-general, were tortured; Nogaret was ruined. The nobles in many provinces regained the privileges of which they had been deprived: their old rights of justice were restored with trial by battle and the right of private war; procedure by written depositions, which made the king's lawyers necessary, was abolished; the royal judges were deposed, and so forth. The general demand, which was a clever move on the part of the nobles, was that the king should no longer have relations with the vassals of his barons. At the same time, however, in order to procure some money, Louis made a solemn declaration that "according to the law of nature, all are born free," from which it followed that as all Frenchmen were naturally free, the serfs on the royal demesne might purchase their liberty. From this time serfdom constantly declined; in contrast to that which had occurred in previous periods, liberty became the rule for rural, as it had long since been for urban, populations, and such serfdom as survived was an exception. The last serfs were freed only in the reign of Louis XVI.

Philip the Fair had expelled the Jews; Louis allowed them to return on condition that they surrendered to him two-thirds of their property. The Jews were then regarded as sponges which might be squeezed at pleasure. They were expelled that their goods might be confiscated and they were recalled with a view to future confiscations.

The Salic Law.—Louis X. left only a daughter, but the queen, Clementine of Hungary, gave birth some months later to a posthumous son, John, who lived only eight days. The question arose as to whether his sister should take the crown. A text in the Gospels says, "the lilies toil not . . . and yet even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these." This clearly indicated that the kingdom of the lilies ought not to pass to the distaff. Such reasoning had weight in the fourteenth century, and there were other arguments against a female succession. There was no desire that a stranger should acquire France by marriage, and therefore the States-General applied to the crown that rule of succession which was said to have applied anciently to Salic lands. They excluded the daughter of Louis X. from the throne, and thus the right of women to succeed, which was recognised in fiefs, was not accepted for the succession to the crown.

Philip the Tall, after being regent for five or six months, was proclaimed king in place of his niece (1316). This decision told against the new king himself, for he also only left daughters who were disinherited in favour of their uncle, Charles IV. This last prince was predeceased by his two sons and his widow gave birth to a daughter who was equally excluded from the throne. Charles himself said to his barons on his deathbed, "If the queen gives birth to a son he will be your king; if it be a daughter the crown belongs to Philip of Valois, and I appoint him regent" (1328). The path was thus opened for the accession of a new branch of the Capetians, the Valois.

Philip V. (1316–1322).—The reigns of Philip V. and Charles IV. contain few events of military importance, but are marked by many measures for the organisation of the administration of the country. Philip V. three times summoned the States-General, the periodicity of which seemed to be established, and he excluded the clergy from the parliament in order that this body might only contain members fully subject to royal authority. The clergy afterwards returned as clerical councillors. Philip instituted (1318) the Privy Council or Council of State, which was the deliberative body; the officers of the crown and the

clerks of the closet, from which later arose the secretaries of state, were the executive body. He wished to establish uniformity of money, weights, and measures, in order that the people might trade more securely, and he issued many ordinances, showing a remarkable spirit of order and economy, concerning finance, the chamber of accounts, the administration of lakes and forests, and other matters. The royal demesne was declared to be inalienable and irreducible. During this reign there was a cruel persecution of Jews and lepers.

Letters of Nobility.—Like his grandfather Philip III., Philip the Tall gave to his commoners letters of nobility, an innovation which, by bringing fresh blood into the aristocracy, ensured its vitality but changed its character. Originally nobility had been personal; feudal nobility was an attribute of a fief. The kings separated the noble from the fief, and the change was important, since when letters of nobility might be bought there could be no true aristocracy. All might be noble by paying.

Rural Communities.—Threatened from above by the kings, the feudal spirit was threatened from below by the people. The progress of the towns continued and that of the rural districts began. The citizens secured from Philip V. the right to form military bodies; each town had a captain for the burgher militia, each bailiwick had a captain-general, and in this century, if not in this reign, ecclesiastical parishes became civil communities. Already the people of the rural districts, who had been isolated, were becoming united, first under the Church and under the supervision of the baron's intendent, and later under a syndic or mayor always nominated by the local lord and having the duty of summoning the people to discuss their common interests. Thus municipal organisation spread to the country, a change first noted in a document in 1380.

Charles IV. (1322–1328).—Charles IV. published various edicts relating to trade; he increased the export duties, expelled the Lombard merchants who had been recalled by Louis X. and whom he sent back to their own land as naked as they came. But he showed a just severity. The Baron of l'Ile en Jourdain, convicted of various crimes, was hanged despite the prayers of all the nobles and the intervention of his uncle, the pope. Abroad, Charles supported the revolution in England which drove Edward II. from the throne and received the homage of Edward III. for Guienne and Ponthieu. In Germany, he almost obtained the imperial crown. But an evil fate pursued his house. These princes, tall and handsome, who seemed to be

destined to a long career, died in the flower of their age ; Philip IV. was forty-six ; Louis X. was twenty-seven ; Philip V. was twenty-eight; and Charles IV. was thirty-four. The people saw in these early deaths the vengeance of Heaven on the family which had overthrown Boniface VIII., possibly poisoned Benedict XI., and murdered the Templars.

The Middle Ages, at least in France, drew to their close, since all that was dear to them, the crusades, chivalry, and feudalism, had now either passed away or was passing. The papacy, ruined in prestige under Boniface VIII., was captive at Avignon ; the successor of Hugh Capet was a despot; and the sons of commoners sat in the States-General of the realm opposite to nobles and clergy.

SEVENTH PERIOD—THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR: RENEWED ANARCHY

(1336–1453)

CHAPTER XXVIII

PHILIP VI., FOUNDER OF THE LINE OF CAPETIAN-VALOIS (1328–1350)

Power of the King of France before the War with England.—Philip VI. of Valois, cousin of Charles IV., nephew of Philip the Fair, and grandson of Philip III., acquired the crown in virtue of the Salic Law, which had three times in twelve years been interpreted in a sense contrary to the rights of female heirs. Edward III., King of England, grandson of Philip IV. by his mother Isabella, protested against his exclusion and claimed the crown; but the internal troubles of England forced him to recognise the right of Philip VI., to whom he did homage for the duchy of Guienne. The victory of Cassel, gained by Philip over the rebellious subjects of the Count of Flanders, gave the new royal house the sanction of glory (1328).

The Flemings had placed on their standards the insulting device :—

"Quand ce coq icy chantera
Le roi trouvé cy entera."

They took up their position on a hill in the neighbourhood of Cassel, but Philip had the wisdom not to attack them in this position. The patience of the Flemings was worn down by the ravaging of their lands and when they descended from their post of vantage the knights slew 13,000 of them.

Never, since the days of Charles the Great, had a French king appeared to be so powerful. Direct master of three-fourths of his kingdom, overlord, on account of the fiefs which they held in France, of the Kings of Majorca, Navarre, and England; allied with the Kings of Bohemia and Scotland; related by blood to the Kings of Naples and Hungary; protector of the pope, whom he held in quasi-captivity at Avignon, Philip IV. extended his

influence far and wide and thought of displaying himself as the head of Christendom, as the leader of European chivalry, in a new and final crusade. It was while affairs were in this state, while his magnificent and knightly court was absorbed in dreams of glory and pleasure, while his land, already accustomed to despotism, saw peace and order leading to an increase of industry and commerce, that there occurred the unhappy war which hurled France back into anarchy for more than a hundred years.

Causes of the Hundred Years' War: Claim of Edward III. Edward III. sighed for that fair crown of France, to which he seemed to be entitled by birth. Circumstances had compelled him in 1328 to recognise Philip of Valois, but circumstances change, and by 1336 they had done so. Philip was well aware of Edward's covert ambition and did not fail to attempt to increase the difficulties of his potential rival, aiding the Scots in war against England. But Edward defeated Scotland and determined to assist the first enemy who might rise against France, as Philip had assisted the foes of England. When Robert of Artois, accused of having attempted the life of the king, fled to England, he was at once welcomed.

Robert of Artois (1330).—Robert of Artois was a prince of the blood, one of the princes of the lilies. He had claims to the county of Artois, which was held first by his aunt and then by her daughters. In order to make good his claim he forged some documents and bribed false witnesses. The case, during which this crime was discovered, led to another. Robert had probably poisoned his aunt and the eldest of his cousins. A decree of the court of peers condemned him to the loss of his property and to perpetual banishment (1332). He retired to Brabant, and, to revenge himself, practised black arts against the king's son. According to the belief of the Middle Ages it was possible to kill any one by securing some sorcerer to make his image in wax, this image being baptised and then, after a mass and a religious consecration, left to melt in the sun or stabbed to the heart with a needle, when the person whom it represented died slowly, but not less surely, from the wound. Robert's conduct was discovered. Alarmed at the prospect of a prosecution for sorcery, he felt that he was too near France, and therefore fled to England, where he exerted himself to urge Edward III. into war (1336).

Affairs of Flanders : Artevelde: Naval Battle of Sluys (1340).—Edward had another reason for taking up arms. The Flemings were at that time the most industrious, the richest, and the freest people in Europe. Count Louis de Nevers of Flanders,

always in need of money, infringed the privileges of the burghers to procure it and punished all resistance with cruelty. The cloth of Flanders was made from English wool, and hence, if the count was pro-French by temperament, his people were pro-English from interest. In 1336 they expelled Louis, and their popular leader, Artevelde, at once demanded the support of Edward III., giving him the disastrous advice that he should claim the throne of France in order to remove the possible scruples of the Flemings, who might have hesitated to fight their suzerain; but who hesitated no longer when their assumption of arms was thus cloaked by a pretence of legitimacy.

The war began in 1337 on the side of Flanders and languished for many years. The French, defeated in a naval battle at Sluys, owing to the inexperience of their admirals who had never seen the sea, were victorious at St. Omer, Edward being checked at the siege of Tournai. For some time, a truce secured a cessation of hostilities.

Affairs of Brittany (1341–1343): Countess Jeanne de Montfort.—In 1341 hostilities were resumed in Brittany, where the two kings supported rival candidates for the ducal throne. Duke John III. died leaving no children. The question arose as to whether the duchy should pass to Jeanne de Penthièvre, wife of Charles of Blois and daughter of the eldest brother of the late duke, or to the late duke's youngest brother, John de Montfort, who had survived him. The two claimants put forward Mosaic Law, the rescripts of the Roman emperors, and Salic Law and custom. The lawyers discussed the documents; political considerations decided the issue. Charles of Blois was Philip VI.'s nephew; if he succeeded, the duchy would come into closer dependence on the French crown, and a decree of the parliament was given in his favour. John de Montfort hastened to England, promised to recognise Edward as King of France and to hold Brittany as a fief from him, provided that the king engaged to aid him and to defend him as his man and vassal with all his power. Thus began one of those wars full of "meetings, fair attacks, fair repulses, bright feats of arms, and grand deeds of valour," of which Froissart tells the story with grace and charm, but which were for the people an appalling calamity. Charles of Blois, supported by a large French army, including even the king's son, at first besieged his rival in the city of Nantes. Thirty Breton knights were taken in a neighbouring château. Charles of Blois, despite his piety, which secured for him the reputation of a saint, and Duke John, despite the fact that he

was later surnamed the Good, caused these prisoners to be decapitated and their heads to be hurled by catapults into the town. The terrified burghers capitulated, and John de Montfort was imprisoned in the Louvre at Paris.

"Countess Jeanne de Montfort was in the city of Rennes when she heard that her husband was taken; though she was filled with great grief, she bravely rallied her friends and adherents, and showed them her little son, named John after his father, saying to them, 'Ah, lords, do not mourn for your master whom we have lost; he was only one man. See, here is my son, who, God willing, shall be his father's avenger and who shall do great things for you. I have enough; I will give him to you and you will have a captain such as shall lead you to victory.' After this, she went from Rennes to all the fortresses and chief towns, taking her young son with her, reviving the spirit of her men and reinforcing the garrisons with men and all things needful, till she came to Hennebon, where she passed all the winter. She had chosen that place, on the Blavet, near the sea, that she might be able to be in touch with England." (Froissart.)

"So when the spring returned many lords and a great crowd of men-at-arms joined Charles of Blois at Nantes and formed the siege of Rennes. The city was taken after having defended itself valiantly against many assaults, and the French advanced on Hennebon and besieged it vigorously. They had twelve engines which hurled vast stones on the city and great pieces of rock. The countess, fully armed and mounted on a fair charger, rode through the streets of the place, and called on her people to defend themselves boldly. She made the women, married and unmarried, prepare weapons and carry stones to the engines to hurl at her enemies, with bombs and fire-pots."

"The Countess of Montfort made a bold throw. She ascended a tower, to see better how her men fought. She looked and saw those of the host, lords and others, who had left their posts to see the assault; she mounted on horseback with three hundred men-at-arms, and going out by a gate which was not attacked, she hurled herself very bravely on the tents and posts of these lords and burned them. When the lords saw their tents burning and heard the cries which came from them, they were all alarmed and ran back crying, 'Treason, treason.' The countess then gathered all her men together and saw that she could not regain the town without too great loss; she went by another road and came to the château of Auray, three or four leagues from Hennebon. For five days the garrison of Hennebon was

alarmed and filled with great doubt, not knowing what had befallen the countess; but on the sixth night she, having gathered 500 companions well armed and mounted, left Auray and came at sunrise and rode to one of the flanks of the host and caused the gate of Hennebon to be opened and entered the place to the great joy of her people and to the sound of many trumpets and timbrels." Help from England caused the raising of the siege; the traitor Robert of Artois fell about this time in a skirmish near Vannes.

Little by little, the two kings found themselves engaged in hostilities. In 1342 Edward III. appeared in person in Brittany and undertook the sieges of Vannes, Rennes, and Nantes. On the other side, Duke John of Normandy assembled an army which included a vast number of barons and more than 40,000 soldiers. The two hosts met near Malestroit. The English, outnumbered four to one by their enemies, had taken care to occupy a strong position. It was midwinter; both sides were short of provisions; icy rains flooded the two camps and increased the sickness in the armies. The papal legates intervened and (January 19, 1343) secured the acceptance of a truce which was to last until Michaelmas, 1346.

Expedition of Edward III. into France.—Some time afterwards, Oliver de Clisson and fourteen Breton knights, who had sworn fealty to the King of England, were invited by Philip VI. to a great tournament at Paris; they were at once arrested and executed without formal trial. Edward made himself their avenger, and prepared a considerable army. The question arose as to the best point to land. In Brittany the French party had regained the ascendancy; Guienne was distant, the king's son held the frontier with a strong army, and a tragedy had closed Flanders to the English. Artevelde, Edward's godfather, as he was called, wished to hand over the land to the English; the Prince of Wales, Edward's eldest son, was to reign in Flanders. But the Flemings wished no more to belong to the King of England than to the King of France, and Artevelde was murdered in his house by the very people who had idolised him. The English fleet was sailing towards the mouth of the Gironde when a storm drove it back in the Channel. A new traitor, Geoffrey of Harcourt, advised a landing in Normandy, promising the support of his vassals and of the whole province. The king landed with 32,000 men (July 12, 1346) at La Hougue St. Vast in the Cotentin. He captured Barfleur, Cherbourg, Valogne, and St. Lô without difficulty. On July 26 he was under the walls of

Caen, "a town larger than any in England except London." The burghers boldly attacked him. "When," says Froissart, "the burghers saw the English advancing, coming forward in three battles in close order, and saw the pennants and banners fluttering in the wind, and heard the cries of the archers, things which they had never beheld or heard, they were so terrified and discomforted that nothing could stay their flight." The English entered the town with the fugitives, killing on all sides, giving no quarter. But the burghers regained their courage and defended themselves in their houses; more than five hundred English were killed or wounded when Edward caused the battle to cease by promising to spare the lives of the inhabitants. The town of Louviers, which was already "great, wealthy, and a commercial centre," was next taken. An attempt on Rouen was checked; Edward advanced up the left bank of the Seine and burned Pont de l'Arche, Vernon, Poissy, and St. Germain. His scouts came in sight of Paris and burned Bourg la Reine and St. Cloud.

But Philip had assembled a large army and advanced against the English. Edward restored the bridge of Poissy and, having crossed the Seine there, retired towards Ponthieu, his inheritance, in order that he might have a secure position behind the Somme. Philip had caused all the fords over this river to be fortified and guarded. At Blanquetaque he had placed 1000 men-at-arms and 5000 Genoese archers. Edward forced the passage, but realising that he could retreat no farther, halted and (August 26) drew up his army in battle array on the edge of some rising ground near Crecy, having placed his men in good order and having disposed his forces with skill.

Battle of Crecy (1346).—Philip advanced from Abbeville to engage the enemy at daybreak, the English being five leagues distant. A heavy rain pursued his army during the whole march. Four knights sent to reconnoitre the English position reported what they had discovered and advised the king to give his forces a night's rest. Philip ordered a halt. But the great nobles of France who commanded the various divisions of the army made it their pride to press on one before the other in order to be as near as possible to the English. "Neither the king nor the marshals had any control over their men, for there was a crowd of great lords and each wished to show his power. They rode forward without order and without plan, and thus found themselves in the presence of the enemy. As soon as the English saw the French coming near, they drew themselves up in array with-

out any haste, and ranged their battles. When King Philip came to the place where the English were drawn up in battle array, his blood boiled, for he hated them, and he cried to his marshals, 'Order the Genoese to advance and engage, in the name of God and St. Denis.'"

The rain, which had not ceased to fall, had rendered the bows of the Genoese unfit for use. Therefore, when they were ordered to attack, "they were much distressed and wearied since they had marched on foot that day more than six leagues, fully armed, and carrying their cross-bows; and they answered their officers that they were not in a condition to perform any great feats of arms. When the Count of Alençon heard this, he was enraged and cried, 'Ride down this rabble which fails in its duty.' Despite their arguments, and though the day was far advanced, the Genoese were again ordered to attack, which they did with much resolution. But the English, who awaited them in silence, and who, while the rain was falling, had kept their bowstrings covered under their doublets, let a shower of arrows fall on them. Edward had placed bombardiers among his archers who threw small lighted balls of fire in order to frighten and destroy the horses; these bombs caused such fear and noise that it seemed as if God was thundering, and a great destruction of men and horses was caused. The Genoese lost heart and slowly retreated, but a barrier of armed Frenchmen, mounted and richly equipped, barred their way. The King of France, when their poor display was seen and their defeat became clear, gave orders that "all the rabble should be killed, since they unreasonably bar our way."

The carrying out of this order naturally involved the loss of the battle, since a vast confusion resulted from which the English profited. The old King John of Bohemia, who, though blind, was fully armed, was held on his horse by two knights in the midst of his forces. When he heard that the battle had begun, he said to his attendants, "I ask you and specially order you to lead me forward so that I may strike a blow with my sword." His knights tied their horses to his and together they rode into the midst of their enemies, where all three were slain.

The French princes, who had lost the battle by their rashness, paid bravely for their error with their lives. They cut their way through the first ranks of the English, which were composed of archers, and attacked the lines of men-at-arms commanded by the Prince of Wales. For a moment the effort of the French appeared to be so formidable that Edward was begged to advance

with the third division to the help of his son, but the king, who formed an accurate estimate of the course of the battle from the windmill in which he was stationed, would not engage his reserves, and replied that the boy should be left to win his spurs, that he might have the honour of the victory. The cannon, which were first employed in a pitched battle upon this occasion, caused more alarm than damage, but the arrows of the English archers and the spears of the men-at-arms laid low a number of knights, who, on their frightened horses, attacked without order an army which was well posted and arranged. Philip of Valois, whose horse was killed under him, displayed marked courage; he was at last persuaded to abandon the field. Late at night he arrived before the château of Broye. "Open, open," he cried, knocking at the gate, "it is the unhappy King of France." In like circumstances Francis I. is said to have uttered words, more proud if not more true, "All is lost, save honour."

France had never suffered so terrible a defeat. Eleven princes, eighty barons, 1200 knights, and 30,000 soldiers were left dead on the field, without including two detachments of mercenaries who fell into the hands of the English on the following day and were equally destroyed.

Siege of Calais: Eustace de St. Pierre (1347).—Instead of penetrating farther into France after this glorious victory, Edward III. continued his retreat, since he had nowhere where he might recruit his forces and no port at which he might receive reinforcements from England. He led his army to Calais, the siege of which place he undertook (September 3, 1346). The town was strongly fortified, and the king realised that he could not breach the walls, but he determined to reduce the place by famine, for which purpose he resolved to spend the winter there. Round Calais he caused rather a second town than a camp to be constructed, and the English were housed in excellent wooden huts, fully provisioned, in which they recovered from the fatigues of their campaign without abandoning it. Philip, with the languor of despair, gathered a new army at Amiens. It was not ready until July, 1347, and then, as he found all ways of approach to be either impracticable or occupied by the enemy, his forces withdrew and were disbanded, after having shown their banners in the distance to the unhappy defenders of Calais, already reduced to the last extremities of hunger. When their provisions were entirely exhausted, the citizens implored the mercy of the English king; Edward at first demanded the unconditional surrender of the whole population, but afterwards

required that six burghers should come out in their shirts, with halters round their necks, bearing to him the keys of the town and castle and placing themselves at his mercy.

When John de Vienne returned to Calais with Edward's reply the town bell was rung to gather every one in the town hall. At the sound men and women gathered, eager to hear the news, though they were so worn with hunger that they could not stand. When they heard the answer, all began to cry and weep that there was so hard and pitiless a heart in the world. Presently there arose Eustace de St. Pierre, the richest of the burghers, and said before them all, "My lords, it would be grievous and pitiable to permit such men as are here to die of hunger or in any other way, if a remedy can be found, and great thanks and gratitude towards Our Lord would be due were so great an evil avoided. I have great hope that I shall find grace and pardon with the Lord if I die to save this people, and therefore I would be the first, and willingly put myself forward, to go barefoot and with a halter round my neck, and to place myself at the mercy of the King of England." When Eustace de St. Pierre spoke thus all reverenced his self-sacrifice, and many men and women threw themselves at his feet weeping tenderly. Next another burgher, prominent and great, who had two fair daughters, rose and said that he would be a companion to his fellow, Eustace de St. Pierre; this was Sieur Jean d'Aire. Then there followed a third, Sieur Jacques de Vissant, who was rich and possessed of much property, and who said that he would bear his two cousins company, as did Pierre de Vissant, his brother, and then a fifth and a sixth. Edward, surrounded by all his barons, awaited them at the place where he lodged. "Sire," said Walter de Mauny to him, "here are the representatives of the city of Calais at your orders." Edward drew himself up stiffly and looked at them coldly, for he hated the citizens of Calais on account of the great damage which in the past they had done to his realm by sea. The six burghers fell on their knees before him and with joined hands cried, "Gentle sire and gentle king, see here these six who have been notable citizens of Calais and great merchants; we bring you the keys of the town and castle of Calais and surrender ourselves at your mercy and place ourselves at your absolute disposal to save the people of Calais, who have suffered much from sorrow. Have pity on us and mercy for your great nobility." There was not a noble or brave man who was not moved to tears, but the king regarded them with much anger, for his heart was hard and he was so filled

with wrath that he could not speak, and when he did speak, it was to order them to be beheaded. All his barons and knights prayed for their pardon, as such an act would show the king to be without pity or mercy, but they could not move Edward. Sir Walter de Mauny spoke in his turn for them all; the king ground his teeth and cried, "Let them be beheaded." Then the Queen of England, all humbly, being far advanced in pregnancy, and weeping from the sorrow which she could not restrain, fell on her knees before the king, and said, "Gentle sire, since after great peril I crossed the sea, as you know, I have asked no favour from you. Now I ask humbly for a gift to me, for the Son of the Blessed Mary, and for the love that you bear me, that you give me the lives of these six men." The king heard her and looked very tenderly at the wife whom he loved, as she wept, and his heart melted, and he answered, "I love you too dearly to do otherwise than as you ask. You pray me so that I know not how to refuse, and though it pains me, take them, I give them to you, do with them what you will." The good queen gave him many thanks. Then she rose and caused the six burghers to rise also, took them into her chamber, clothed them and fed them, and then sent them in safety out of the army. It must be added that Edward kept John de Vienne and all the knights who had taken part in the defence of the place in prison, and that he ordered all the inhabitants to leave Calais, which was repeopled by Englishmen.

The two opponents were equally weary of war when Pope Clement VI. offered his mediation, which both desired. The two kings signed for themselves and their allies a truce which was to last ten months and which left each in possession of that which he held (September 28, 1347).

The Black Death (1348).—To the misfortunes of war a still more disastrous calamity was now added. The Black Death, after having devastated a great part of Europe, reached France. "In many places," says the continuator of Nangis, "of twenty men two only remained alive, and in the Hôtel Dieu at Paris the death-roll was such that for some time five hundred corpses were borne each day in carts to the cemetery of the Innocents." The people accused the Jews of having poisoned the wells and fountains, attacked them in many places and put them to death without the government being able to prevent them. The Black Death is said to have carried off a third of the population of Europe, and at Paris, according to a report sent to Pope Clement VI., 80,000 persons died. As a sanitary precaution, Philip VI.

issued an ordinance against blasphemers, ordering that for each offence men should lose first a lip, then the other lip, and finally the tongue.

Internal Administration: The Gabelle. To the reign of Philip VI. must be traced the origin of a tax, the *gabelle*, which remained odious during the whole period of the old monarchy. An ordinance (1343) established that no one might sell salt in France except such as had been bought from the king's stores. Such stores, or *gabelles*, were established in various places; all the salt produced was brought there and sold at a price which the king fixed, as a result of which he won the anger and disfavour of the people, great and small. The duties on exports were increased, and another tax, ruinous for trade, was levied on all goods sold within the realm and on the town markets. These innovations were reminiscent of the Roman Empire. The Justinian Code was then widely studied, and Jean Fabvier, the father of French law, published his commentaries on the *Institutes* and the *Code* (1338).

If in these laws, made for and by absolute monarchs, the lawyers found means of arming the French kings with powers which they had not before possessed, the ministers found in the institutions of the Roman Empire means of securing for the treasury resources which the Middle Ages had been unable to supply. The king's advisers, in the attack which they made upon privilege, showed no more respect for the immunities of the clergy than for those of the nobles and of the commons. Under Philip VI., *l'appel comme d'abus* was introduced, which allowed an appeal to the king from episcopal sentences and recourse to him in cases of abuses committed by clerks, and thus reminded the clergy that, though they were priests, they were also citizens and subjects.

In 1338 an assembly of the States-General made the following decree: "The king shall levy no extraordinary taxes from the people without the assent of the three estates, and they shall take solemn oath to this effect." This was the proclamation of the great principle that the people should pay no taxes to which their representatives had not assented. Philip VI. escaped the effect of this ordinance by frequently debasing the coinage. In 1342, the value of money changed almost every week, with disastrous results for commerce. Philip also secured for himself alone, under the name of regalian rights, the dues received by patrons of churches from vacant benefices.

Acquisition of Montpellier and Dauphiné.—One of the last

acts of Philip VI. was the important acquisition of the province which later received the name of Dauphiné. Humbert II., Count of Vienne, called Dauphin of Vienne, because his family bore a dolphin in its arms, sold his estates to Philip VI. for 120,000 florins (1349). From this time the eldest son of the King of France bore the title of dauphin. This acquisition was of the greatest importance since the new province protected Lyons and enabled France at last to reach the Alps. The annexation of Provence now became a mere question of time. Montpellier was bought in this reign from the King of Majorca.

Employment of Cannon in War.—At the time when the kings attained to absolute power, a monk produced an arm which would pierce the most tempered steel and overthrow the strongest walls. Roger Bacon, an English friar, who died during the reign of Philip the Fair, invented gunpowder, or at least revealed the secret of its composition, which had been long known in the East, and of which the Arabs in Spain had availed themselves as early as the thirteenth century. The first mention of its use in France is found in the register of the chamber of accounts at Paris for 1338, where there is a note of a sum paid for "powder and other things needed for the cannon which are before Puy-Guihem in Agénois." These cannon, formed of bands of iron strengthened by circles of iron, made more noise than damage. In a century there was not a town, not a fortress, which could defend its feudal independence against the king's cannon, and the least soldier, armed with an arquebus, could lay low the mightiest lord, despite his Milanese armour, which had hitherto been impenetrable. Equality revived on the battle-field, and when another discovery, that of printing, had been achieved, equality spread, with the assistance of the royal power, through civil society.

CHAPTER XXIX

JOHN THE GOOD (1350–1364)

King John.—The death of Philip of Valois, which occurred on August 22, 1350, made no change in the condition of the realm. John, who succeeded to the throne, was thirty-one years old and had long been employed in affairs of state. Like his father, he was impetuous and violent, brave and extravagant. During the first months after his accession he distributed among the

nobles the accumulations in the treasury, and when money was not forthcoming he granted remissions of payment for the debts which he had contracted. Money became still more scarce; to secure it the king had recourse to the most extraordinary methods, drawing up elaborate police regulations which brought in numberless fines; debasing the coinage to such an extent that its value was changed eighteen times in one year, and the silver mark in a few months rose in value from four livres to seventeen livres eight sous.

States-General of 1351: Charles the Bad.—Such curious expedients were far from sufficing for the needs of a prince who on one occasion, at a time of distress, gave 50,000 crowns to one of his knights. John dared to ask the nation for the money of which he was in need, and he convoked the States-General at Paris in 1351. No satisfactory account of what passed has been preserved. There were many complaints, some promises, and no reforms. The war continued in Brittany between the knights of the two parties, but the kings no longer intervened, even signing a renewal of the truce. But besides the two kings who disputed the throne of France, there was a third who had a better right to that throne than either of the others. Charles, King of Navarre, whose turbulence and intriguing disposition gained for him the epithet of "the Bad," was the son of the daughter of Louis X., and therefore, if the Salic Law were disregarded, was clearly the rightful heir to the crown. While waiting for the day when he might realise his hopes, he laid claim to Champagne and Angoumois, and when the latter was granted to the Constable de Lacerda, an intimate friend of the king, Charles caused him to be murdered. John retorted by seizing the Norman possessions of the King of Navarre, and Charles crossed to England.

New Expedition of Edward III. and the Black Prince to France (1355).—The English had collected so much booty during their first attack on France, gaining 40,000 pieces of cloth in the single town of Caen, that they were quite ready to renew the adventure. Edward invaded the country by way of Calais and ravaged Artois (1355), while his son, the Black Prince, attacked from Bordeaux and returned from an expedition against Languedoc with a thousand waggon-loads of booty. John did not offer a single battle to the invaders, but the expense of raising soldiers against them ruined him, and the treasury being empty the States-General were summoned to fill it.

States-General of 1355.—On this occasion the deputies showed

greater courage. Accustomed to order, economy, and probity in the administration of public affairs, they were angry at this wild extravagance which had invaded the finances of the state, and demanded reform with vigour. They sought the establishment of a fixed coinage, the abolition of the right of plunder by the officials of the king, who, under pretence of the service of his household, pillaged the farms during the journeys of the court and those around the royal residences. The States undertook to supply the king forthwith with 30,000 men-at-arms and five million Parisian livres, payable in one year. But, knowing that money which entered the royal coffers was soon spent, without anything being left for the defence of the realm, they demanded that the sums received should remain, till required, in the hands of receivers. These were appointed by the States and accountable to them alone, being obliged to prove that the whole amount raised had been used for the purposes of the war. The money was to be derived from a *gabelle* on salt and from an *aide* (tax) of eightpence in the pound on everything sold. These two taxes were common to all three orders; even the king, the queen, and the princes of the blood undertook to pay them. In order to secure the loyal and prompt execution of these measures, the assembly appointed a commission of nine of its members to supervise the matter, and then adjourned to an appointed date.

This was nothing less than a revolution. To vote and to receive taxation, to regulate and supervise expenditure, is to exercise no inconsiderable portion of the sovereign power. The deputies of 1355 made the first step towards that distant goal which has hardly been reached in the constitutional monarchies of the present day.

Execution of the Count of Harcourt.—The idea of paying taxes annoyed the nobility; another vigorous opponent of the scheme was the King of Navarre (who had returned to France as a result of a treaty with John), as was also the Count of Harcourt, his friend. At the news of his opposition John cried that he would have no master in France save himself, and one day, when the Dauphin Charles, then nineteen years of age, had invited the King of Navarre and his friends to a banquet, the king, who was aware of the time of the festivity, came to Rouen, surprised the party, and arrested Charles the Bad at his son's table. Despite the prayers and tears of the dauphin, who seemed to be guilty of having drawn his guests into an ambush, John threw Charles the Bad into prison, executed the Count of Harcourt and some others. Such summary justice was to the king's taste; at the

beginning of his reign he had caused the Constable Raoul de Nesle to be beheaded in the very courtyard of his palace. He was charged with having relations with the English. Some months after the arrest of the King of Navarre, John was himself a captive.

Battle of Poitiers (1356) : Captivity of the King.—John laid siege to the little town of Breteuil, which belonged to the King of Navarre, and while engaged on this operation learned that the Prince of Wales had again taken the field with 20,000 men-at-arms and 6000 archers, had crossed the Garonne and Dordogne, ravaged Rouergue, Auvergne, Limousin, and Berry. The Black Prince, burning everything as he advanced, reached the little village of Romorantin. The town opened its gates at the first summons, but the castle was defended by three brave knights, who would not surrender despite the poor character of their fortress. The Prince of Wales, irritated at having lost a knight of whom he was fond before this insignificant place, swore that he would not leave it until he had reduced it. The castle eventually surrendered, but the obstinacy of its defenders placed the English army in a position of extreme difficulty.

The King of France had meanwhile crossed the Loire and had reached Poitiers before the English army, the communications of which with Bordeaux were thus cut. The Black Prince, approaching the city, took up his position on the summit of a steep incline, which was thickly planted with vines and cut up by hedges and bushes. The place was called the field of Mauperтuis and lay near Beauvoir, two leagues north of Poitiers. The Black Prince fortified his position with palisades and ditches, using his waggons as a wall where the ground was most open. It was impossible to reach the summit of the incline except by a lane, along which three knights could hardly ride abreast. The prince posted archers along the hedges beside this road, dismounted his men-at-arms, placed them on the summit, and concealed the remainder of his archers among the vines.

John commanded one of the most brilliant armies which had yet been raised in France. He had under his orders, besides his four sons, twenty-six dukes and counts, 140 knights-banneret, and some 50,000 soldiers, the majority of whom were knights in steel armour. He had only to decline to attack and the English would have been reduced by hunger ; he resolved, however, to avenge the disgrace of Crecy, and instead incurred a disgrace equal to that of his father (September 19, 1356).

The two Marshals of France, Arnold d'Audeneham and John

of Clermont, at the head of 300 chosen knights, instead of turning the enemy's flank and thus reducing their strong position, advanced through the narrow garden which led to the hill. Their horses were pierced again and again by the arrows which rained on them from the hedges ; pain maddened them ; they reared and threw their riders. In a few minutes the whole force was defeated, as the English infantry issued from their hiding-places and cut the thoats of those who had been dismounted. The fugitives pressed back on the body commanded by the dauphin and spread disorder and panic in its ranks. The Prince of Wales seized the moment to charge with the 600 men-at-arms whom he had kept in reserve, to the cry of " St. George and Guienne ! " and fell on the flank of the disordered column ; he cut his way through it and dispersed it. The princes of France, terrified at the confusion, fled, headed by the dauphin, and carried away with them more than 800 lances, who acted as their escort. The second column, commanded by the Duke of Orleans, followed this example.

Two-thirds of the French army was already routed without having engaged the enemy. The third division, commanded by the king, was twice as numerous as the whole English army. But John had made the mistake of causing his men to dismount, and this manœuvre, which was right in the case of the English who were placed among the vines and hedges on the hill, was disastrous for the French who were fighting on open ground. The Prince of Wales caused his men-at-arms to remount, and when his 2000 knights debouched into the plain, no force of infantry was able to resist the weight of these heavy cavalry, clothed in steel. The king was brave ; he placed himself at the head of his men, battle-axe in hand, and laid low a number of the enemy. " He performed miracles, holding his axe with which he defended himself, he attacked his foes." His youngest son, Philip the Bold, remained with him despite the flight of his elder brothers, and at each new attack cried to the king, " Father, guard your right ; father, guard your left ! " The whole battle raged round the person of the king ; the bravest English knights vied in their efforts to secure so rich a prize. He at last surrendered to a gentleman of Artois.

The action, which had begun at dawn, ended at mid-day. The French left 11,000 dead on the field of battle. The English, who had only lost 2500, took as prisoners thirteen counts, one archbishop, seventy barons, and 2000 men-at-arms, without including the prisoners of lesser importance ; they soon found that their

captives were twice as numerous as themselves. The guarding of so large a number caused them some uneasiness, and they therefore hastened to release the majority on payment of ransom and on parole. The prisoners undertook to come to Bordeaux at Christmas with the stipulated sum or to return to captivity. As for the chief captive, the Prince of Wales held him too important to be insulted ; he was treated with respect, the prince waiting on him at supper and only sitting at the king's table to receive his orders. Being eager to place his vast booty and his prisoners in a place of safety, the Black Prince returned at once to Bordeaux and thence to London.

States-General of 1356 and 1357: Etienne Marcel.—The news of this disaster roused consternation and anger in the whole kingdom, since having suffered the shame of such a defeat, the land had also to suffer its terrible results. As soon as those captured at Poitiers were released on parole, they devoted themselves to compelling their vassals and subjects to raise the amount of their ransoms.

Unrest was already great when the Dauphin Charles, Duke of Normandy, appeared at Paris ten days after the battle. He took the title of lieutenant of the King of France and assembled the States, which opened their second session on October 17. The assembly was composed of nearly 800 persons ; the third estate alone numbered 400 deputies, among whom the most active and able was the provost of the merchants of Paris, Etienne Marcel. The bourgeoisie, irritated by the incompetence of the royal government, took its place and attempted to retain it. The deputies demanded the release of the King of Navarre, who had been taken in an ambush, and the establishment of a council of four prelates, twelve knights, and twelve burghers, selected from the States, who were to assist the prince in the administration of the kingdom. The dauphin in alarm adjourned the assembly. But the treasury was empty ; he was forced to recall the assembly (February 5, 1357). The provost, Etienne Marcel, and the Bishop of Laon, Robert Le Coq, then presented the list of grievances which had been drawn up in the first session and demanded that this list should be made known to the States of each province. This communication was accomplished with extraordinary speed, and in a month's time the lists were returned, fortified in a measure by the assent of the nation. On March 3, the dauphin called a general meeting at the palace, when the Bishop of Laon acted as spokesman of the assembly. He required the prince to dismiss twenty-two of his advisers

and servants who were charged with embezzlement and to offer effective guarantees against renewed abuses. Of these guarantees, the most important was that the States should be permitted to meet twice a year, without any further summons, in order to assure themselves that the laws were observed; that they should be allowed to nominate 36 commissioners, twelve from each order, who were to assist the dauphin in the defence of the realm when the States were not sitting. Other elected deputies were to be sent into the provinces with almost unlimited powers, to receive the taxes, pay the royal officials, assemble the provincial States, and perform other duties. On these terms, the States offered a subsidy sufficient for the raising and maintenance of 30,000 men, though they reserved to their own officers the right to hold and expend the money granted. After the bishop had spoken, John de Picquigny, in the name of the nobles, an advocate of Abbeville in the name of the commons, and Etienne Marcel in the name of the burghers of Paris, declared their agreement with his speech.

Great Ordinance of 1357.—Such agreement between the orders rendered all resistance hopeless, and the great ordinance of March, 1357, consisting of sixty-one articles, conceded the demands of the States. The chief points in this document were as follows :—

Government.—The States-General were to meet regularly twice a year at fixed times, and in the intervals between their sessions, a council of thirty-six, chosen by the States, were to aid the prince in the administration of the kingdom. Other elected representatives were to be sent into the provinces with almost unlimited powers and were especially instructed to punish negligent or dishonest officials and to assemble and consult the provincial States.

Finance.—Taxes were to be voted and raised by the States themselves, who should supervise the expenditure of the money raised; the coinage circulating in the kingdom was in future to be invariable.

Army.—Every man in France was to be armed; the nobles were forbidden to fight among themselves or to leave the realm; the soldiers should only be paid by the States.

Justice.—There had been a case which lasted for twenty years and the cost of justice was enormous. The ordinance ordered judges to attend the parliament every day at dawn, to hasten the conclusion of pending suits, and to spare expense as much as possible.

Abuses.—The right of the king to take goods during his travels in the kingdom, which meant a thousand abuses, was abolished. Burghers were empowered to resist the right of plunder, and all alienation of the royal demesne was explicitly forbidden.

In the main these measures were excellent, but political reform, in the face of the victorious English, was dangerous. Moreover, this reforming ordinance, the work of a few deputies in advance of their time, did not represent the work, the opinion, or the wish of France, and when Paris was forced to arm in order to defend and to maintain the work of the States-General, the city stood alone, and no one came to the help of the Parisians.

Murder of the Ministers of the Dauphin (1358).—It was impossible to expect that the monarchy, which had enjoyed absolute power for half a century, would consent to abdicate. As early as April 6, the dauphin, by order of his father, forbade all the subjects of the kingdom to pay the tax which the States had decreed a month earlier. On April 8, he revoked this order, but a few days later he declared that he was resolved to rule alone and not to be in tutelage. On February 22, 1358, he broke a promise, the fulfilment of which was a matter of deep interest to the burghers, and effected a debasement of the coinage by ordinance. Open hostility forthwith appeared at Paris and the burghers gave way to violence, a fault by which the best causes have been ruined. On the day after the issue of the ordinance, the provost of the merchants assembled all the guilds in arms, advanced with them to the dauphin's palace, entered his chamber, and demanded that he should at once devote himself to the defence of the realm which he had inherited and protect the people whom he had abandoned to the rapine of the soldiery. "If I had the means, I would do so willingly," answered Charles, "but those who possess the powers and revenues of the state should also defend it." Other bitter remarks were exchanged, and finally Marcel cried, "Sire, do not be offended at what you see; it must be so." Then, turning to some of those who had come with him, he said, "Do quickly that which we came to do." Thereupon they laid hands on the Marshal of Champagne and the Marshal of Normandy, the dauphin's chief advisers, and killed them so near the prince that his robe was stained with their blood. Charles, in alarm, prayed Marcel to spare him. The provost assured him that he was in no danger, but placed on his head the red and blue cap, the colours of Paris, and himself donned the cap of the prince which he wore throughout the day. Marcel next proceeded to give an account of his proceedings

against the two marshals, "evil traitors," to the populace assembled on the Place de Grève. He spoke from the balcony of the Hôtel de Ville, and the people cried in answer, "We avow the deed and will sustain you." Returning to the palace, he found the dauphin filled with alarm and grief, and said to him, "My lord, do not grieve, for that which has been done has been done by the will of the people." He should have added that it had been done by a minority of the people, of the burghers of Paris, who prepared to enter into conflict with the rest of the nation.

The Nobles arm against Paris.—As a matter of fact, the deputies of the nobles and the majority of the deputies of the clergy had already left the assembly, which only represented the towns which were under the influence of the deputies and municipal council of Paris. After the murder of the two marshals, the nobles showed a strong irritation against those burghers who aspired to control the whole state and whose hands were stained with noble blood. The dauphin having gone to hold the states of Champagne at Provins, the Count de Braine asked him if the Marshal of Champagne had deserved death by any crime which he had committed. Charles answered that the two marshals had always served him well and loyally. The count then fell on his knees and prayed for justice for so atrocious a crime. At the states of Vermandois, held at Compiègne, the nobles offered Charles their services against the rebels of Paris.

This offer was a declaration of war, and civil war began. The dauphin assembled 7000 lances, with whom he lived at free quarters on the land, occupying in turn Meaux, Melun, St. Maur, the bridge of Charenton, and arresting all who came from the upper Seine and Marne. Marcel, on his side, captured the castle of the Louvre, repaired and completed the walls of Paris, dug a trench, placed catapults and cannon on the fortifications, prepared chains which could be instantly drawn across the streets, and hired mercenaries.

The Jacquerie[1] **(1358).**—While the nobles attacked the burghers, the peasants also rose. Upon them especially fell the burden of the evils of the time, for while the towns and castles had nothing to fear from brigands, the villages were the prey of every chief of a robber band. When the enemy plundered, friendly troops pillaged what was left in order to live; if anything yet remained the nobles took that. The barons had to fortify and provision their castles; they had to find pay for their men, to recoup

[1] Revolted peasantry.

themselves for the losses which they had sustained in the war, and to pay their own ransom or the ransom of some friend or relative. They seized the movables, crops, beasts, and implements of the peasants, and ruined the French people to enrich the English, whom they had failed to conquer though outnumbering them ten to one. The peasants, who had in the past been indifferent to the general affairs of the state, began to realise that great battles were fought and lost at their expense.

Following on the exactions of the lords, came those of the soldiery, who were thrown out of work by the cessation of hostilities, but were not ready to abandon so lucrative a calling. Such mercenary leaders, the Welshman Griffiths, the Englishman Robert Knollys, the Frenchman Arnaud de Cervoles, of the great family of Talleyrand-Périgord (surnamed the Archpriest because he held a benefice); Baron Fulk de Laval, Le Hennuyer, Eustace d'Aubrecicourt, and the Germans, Albrecht and Frank Hennekin, held burghers and peasants to ransom, as well as monasteries and churches.

When the peasants learned that the burghers had taken up arms against the nobles, they believed that the time had come for them to avenge their sufferings. They armed themselves, assembled in bands, and attacked the castles. The peasants of Beauvais gave the signal, and the most terrible scenes followed. They spared neither age nor sex, tortured their prisoners, outraged the noblest women, burned little children alive, and left nothing but blood and ashes where they had passed. In Champagne and Picardy alone they numbered more than 100,000, and fancied that they would easily account for the nobles, but the latter, who had at first been taken by surprise, gathered together and a horrible, pitiless war ensued.

Marcel was in too great difficulties to despise any allies who offered themselves. He realised that the burghers alone could not accomplish a revolution, and entered into relations with the Jacquerie. When they advanced on Meaux, where the families of the nobles had taken refuge, he sent two companies of burgher militia to their help, and the inhabitants of the town also made common cause with the peasants. The union of the people of the towns and of the rural districts thus began. Unhappily too much blood had been shed on the path that they travelled together for them to attain their object. Meaux made a successful defence; the Jacquerie were defeated (June 9), tracked to their hiding-places, and exterminated. For some weeks there was a terrible massacre. The sad memory of this horror has

passed down through the ages, and the Jacquerie have remained synonymous with the savage foes of all civilised society.

Marcel allies with Charles the Bad.—Marcel had relied on the peasants, and they had been hanged, burned, and tracked down like wild beasts. He relied also on a noble, a prince, hoping to gain through him a party among the nobles and to obtain cavalry and armed knights to oppose to those of the dauphin. His ally was the King of Navarre, whom he had delivered from prison; Marcel secured for him the grant of the title of captain from the city of Paris (June 15). The new ally often permitted that contempt for the common herd, which he shared with all the nobles, to appear in his speech. He had quite recently massacred in a single fight 3000 of the peasants, and had crowned with a tripod of red-hot iron the leader of this band of Jacquerie, William Caillet. Horrible as the war had been, the burghers felt that there was a certain community of interest between them and the peasants, that the destroyer of one could hardly be the sincere friend of the other. Marcel had chosen a dangerous ally.

Treason of Charles the Bad.—The dauphin advanced on the side of Charenton and St. Maur and reached a point from which he threatened the gate of St. Antoine (July 8, 1358). Marcel asked the King of Navarre to repulse the enemy, but though he marched out of Paris, instead of attacking the dauphin he had a long interview with him and a treaty was concluded between them. The king was promised full satisfaction for all his complaints and 400,000 florins if he handed over the city and Marcel. News of these plans reached Paris; the cry of treason was raised, and the body of aldermen deprived Charles of his title of captain. He soon left the city and attacked the neighbouring district, pillaging and harrying with the dauphin.

Defeats of the Parisians.—The position of Marcel became critical. Provisions began to run short, but the burghers were not disheartened and wished to attack the forces of the King of Navarre. They issued from the city and marched all day towards the district of St. Cloud. Meeting no one, they returned, carrying their steel helmets either in their hands or round their necks, while others from weariness trailed their spears or carried them in their slings. Suddenly 400 men, ambushed on their route, appeared and attacked them; the burghers fled hastily, but 700 held their ground, calling upon their leader who had retired among the first. Marcel gave them no help; he was in negotiation with the enemy.

Death of Marcel (1358).—The capable and adventurous pro-

vost, having attempted an impossible revolution, was driven to take a desperate course. The King of Navarre was his sole resource. In order to avoid revolution, Marcel was anxious to do what Mirabeau had attempted in 1789, what was done in 1830; he aimed not at changing either the government or the dynasty, but at replacing one reigning branch by another. He promised Charles the Bad that he would hand over the gate and bastille of St. Denis, which would enable the prince to make himself master of Paris, that he would put his opponents to death, their houses, if a contemporary account may be credited, having been marked beforehand, and probably that he would cause the prince to be proclaimed king. The execution of the plot was fixed for the night of July 31 to August 1. But one of the aldermen, Jean Maillart, on whom Marcel chiefly relied and whom he called his special friend, had gleaned his plans and defeated them by a counterplot. He entered into relations with Pepin des Essarts and Jean de Charny, the leaders of the dauphin's party, and "these three with their men came a little before midnight to the bastille of St. Denis, where they found Marcel with the keys of the gate in his hands. Jean Maillart was the first to speak, calling to Marcel by his name and crying, 'Stephen, Stephen, what are you doing at this hour?' The provost answered, 'John, I am here to take care of the city of which I have charge.' 'By God,' answered Maillart, 'this is not well; you are here at this hour for no good.; and I show you,' he added to his companions, 'how he bears the keys of the gates in his hand to betray the city.' The provost advanced towards him and cried, 'You lie.' 'By God, it is you who lie,' said Maillart. Then he fell on Marcel and cried to his men, 'To the death, to the death. Every man to his post; they are traitors.' There was a great uproar; the provost would gladly have fled had he been able, but he could not, for he was pressed on all sides. Then Maillart struck him with an axe on the head and felled him to the ground, though he was his friend, nor did he leave him until he was dead and six of those who were with him. The survivors were taken and cast into prison."

The Dauphin Re-enters Paris.—The next day but one the dauphin re-entered Paris leaning on the arm of Jean Maillart. A burgher boldly advanced towards him and cried loudly, "Had my wish been fulfilled, you would not have entered the city; but little will be done for you here." The Count of Tancarville pointed his sword at the peasant, but the dauphin stayed his arm and contented himself with remarking, "You are little

believed, good sir." And the dauphin was right. His victory was complete; the King of Navarre himself made his peace, without stipulating for any personal advantage, declaring that he wished only to be a good Frenchman. Paris, after some executions had taken place, seemed once more to become the royal city, as docile as it had been in the past. But the memory remained of the time when the burghers had dared to speak face to face with their master of justice and good government. In 1413, and after the lapse of almost a century, at the States of 1484, an echo of the bold voices which demanded reform in 1356 was heard. The monarchy showed that it had received a warning; John and Charles V. abandoned the practice of debasing the coinage, and the latter attempted to render the States-General innocuous by introducing some reforms and by ruling wisely.

Miserable Condition of the Kingdom.—The dauphin had returned to Paris, but the state of the kingdom appeared to be desperate. English or French brigand bands scoured the realm. The inhabitants of the country were forced to convert the bell-towers of their churches into forts. Sentinels were posted in them all day to announce the approach of the enemy while their comrades worked; at night all retired to camps built in the marshlands by the rivers, or fortified themselves, with their beasts, in subterranean fastnesses. In the midst of such terrors, industry fared ill; the harvest showed the effect, and famine threatened the land with another scourge.

Negotiations.—Peace discussions began. Weary of the magnificent hospitality with which he was entertained at Windsor, John treated with the English king. He abandoned to him the coast of the Channel, Calais, Montreuil, Boulogne, Ponthieu, and Normandy; the whole of Aquitaine, including Gascony, the Bordelais, Agenois, Quercy, Périgord, Limousin, Poitou, Saintonge, and Aunis; Touraine and Anjou; and he promised four million crowns as his personal ransom. In other words, he ceded half France and the mouths of all her rivers.

When this treaty was brought to Paris the dauphin refused to execute it. To gain support in his conflict with his father he assembled a mere shadow of an assembly of the three orders at Paris (May 19, 1359). It rejected the shameful convention, adding that King John "would have to remain in England and that God, when He saw fit, would provide a remedy."

Expedition of Edward III. to France (1359): New System of Warfare.—Five months later (October 28, 1359), Edward landed at Calais with his four sons, the chief nobles of his realm, 6000

mailed horsemen, 6000 waggons filled with munitions, kitchens, mills, forges, tents, and all that was needed to render life comfortable. He had also hawks and falcons for the chase, and wherries made of boiled leather for fishing in Lent. "He had so great a multitude of men that the whole land was covered; they were so richly armed and equipped that it was wonderful and delightful to see the glistening arms, waving banners, and the host in battle array slowly riding along. He had also five hundred varlets with stones and slings who went before the host and opened gates and roads, cutting down trees and bushes to make the passage easy."

The season of the year was unfavourable for the expedition. It rained incessantly. On November 30 the English arrived before Reims; the archbishop, John de Craon, closed the gates and valiantly repulsed all attacks. Edward had long before announced that he was determined to be consecrated there. Seven weeks were spent before the walls, and yet the city was not taken. Edward hoped every day that he would be attacked and gain another victory such as those of Crecy and Poitiers. Finally, as no French army appeared, he resumed his march slowly, and, without taking the shortest way, advanced across the district of Châlons to Bar-le-Duc, and across that of Troyes to Tonnerre, the Duke of Burgundy saving his lands from pillage by paying 200,000 crowns of gold. Finally Edward turned towards Paris and encamped two leagues from that city, at Bourg-la-Reine. The English heralds offered battle to the dauphin, who refused it. One of Edward's knights, Walter of Mauny, approached the ramparts to throw a lance at them; Charles strictly forbade his knights to leave the defences. He was resolved not to carry on war as the nobles had hitherto done.

Popular Resistance.—Thus the burghers safe in their towns, and the nobles in their castles, allowed the storm to pass by; it could not touch them behind their walls. All the misfortunes fell on the peasants, who did not dare even to defend themselves. They went into the fields only when they had posted a sentinel in their clock tower, who each day watched to sound the alarm when the robbers appeared in the distance. At night they took refuge in the marshes or in subterranean caves. But misery at last gave them courage; despair gave them strength. They faced these men clothed from head to foot in armour, before whom they had been used to tremble; in many places the foreign aggressor began to meet local resistance from the people more dangerous to them than the grand attacks of the feudal princes.

Edward himself grew weary. It is said that as the English king and his men rode, worn out and depressed, across the plain of Beauce, a terrible storm overtook them and that the king vowed by Notre-Dame of Chartres to devote all his energy to restoring peace between the two peoples. It was not a tempest that suddenly changed the king's mood; it was weariness of a war which never ended, and in which no glory was to be gained since no battles were fought; no more booty could be expected since everything had either been taken already or hidden in the innumerable fortresses with which France bristled.

Treaty of Bretigny (1360).—The dauphin was still more eager to remove the English from his land, since "France was in agony, and if her ill endured but a little, she would perish." Conferences were opened at Bretigny, near Chartres (May 1, 1360). The English envoys at first demanded the crown of France; then they reduced their claims to the inheritance of the Plantagenets. At last Edward agreed to content himself with the duchy of Aquitaine, with all its dependencies, Gascony, Poitou, Saintogne, Aunis, Agenois, Périgord, Limousin, Quercy, Rouergue, and Angoumois, which were to be ceded in full sovereignty, and Calais, with the counties of Ponthieu and Guines and the viscounty of Montreuil. The king's ransom was fixed at three million gold crowns. As a guarantee for this sum, John was to give Edward the choice of a certain number of hostages, drawn from the noblest lords and richest burghers of the kingdom. He took them with him across Normandy, on his way to embark at Honfleur, the Havre of the period. The provinces ceded to the English were handed over despite the protests of the majority of the inhabitants, most of whom cried with the men of La Rochelle, "We honour the English with our lips, but in our hearts we curse them." For a whole year that port refused to open its gates to the English.

At Abbeville the citizens distinguished themselves still more. When that patriotic city saw the soldiers riding in its streets who, for fifteen years, had trodden France under foot, and who knew not how to restrain themselves in the presence of those whom victory had handed over to them, plots were hatched, a riot ensued, and was suppressed. A rich burgher, Ringois, was taken. The English commandant showed moderation, and offered Ringois his liberty on the sole condition that he should swear fealty to Edward; the offer was refused. The burgher was carried to Dover and threatened with death if he continued obstinate; he persisted in his refusal. He was placed on a plat-

form of the fortress ; he was forced to mount the highest parapet, while the sea raged at the foot of the cliff. He had but to say a word to save his life ; he still refused, and the guards hurled him down. The Greeks and Romans did not allow the names of their bravest and most devoted sons to sink into oblivion ; in France to-day the name of Ringois is unknown.

It remained to find the money for the first instalment of the ransom. It was procured by a shameful expedient. "The King of France," says the historian Mattee Villani, "sold his flesh and blood." He handed over, in exchange for 600,000 florins, his daughter Isabella, eleven years of age, to the son of the most ferocious tyrant in Italy, John Galeazzi Visconti, who hunted men in the streets of his capital and hurled them alive into furnaces. Thanks to the receipt of this money the king left Calais October 25.

Last Acts of King John : The Second House of Burgundy.—On December 5 an ordinance was issued by John announcing that, despite the great pity which he felt for his people, there would be levied a new tax on all merchandise sold or exported, also a tax on wine. In return, the king promised henceforth to do good and true justice to all, to place only good money in circulation, to abolish the right of plunder, and to remove other abuses which weighed heavily on the poor. Neither the promises nor the ordinance produced any result, as nothing could be produced from a land which a renewal of the Black Death was then devastating, which the English had ravaged, which the grand companies were still ravaging, and where there was nothing left to take. It was necessary to have recourse to other resources, to borrow, to revoke all grants made by previous kings since Philip the Fair, to make terms with the Jews, who were not only re-established in the kingdom but also granted considerable privileges.

With the money thus procured, the king might have devoted himself to destroying the bands of brigands, who had of late wasted the realm from Lorraine to Provence, and who defeated and killed James of Bourbon at Brignais near Lyons. Instead, John went short journeys at great expense to take possession of the inheritance of the Capetian line of Burgundy, which the death of Philip of Rouvres placed in his hands. From Burgundy John went south to Avignon, where he spent six months in festivities and in planning a marriage with the famous Queen Joanna of Naples. The pope, who had already been twice held to ransom by the grand companies, made John a proposition

calculated to appeal to his chivalrous imagination; that he should lead a crusade at the head of these warlike bands and win glory for himself while freeing France from their presence. It is not impossible that John would have engaged in this foolish enterprise, had he not heard at this moment that his son, the Duke of Anjou, had escaped from the hands of the English, who held him as a hostage. John believed that his honour was concerned towards a fellow-king, and determined to take his son's place. He thus escaped in a chivalrous manner from the embarrassments of his position and from the spectacle of the misery of France. He spent part of the winter in London in "great rejoicings and amusements, in dinners and suppers, and in other like ways." The fêtes and banquets killed him; he died at London at the age of forty-four (April 8, 1364). He deserves credit for the example of good faith which he gave.

One of his last acts, which was more fatal to France than the Battle of Poitiers, was the grant of the duchy of Burgundy to his son, Philip the Bold. Philip founded in this great fief the second ducal house of Burgundy, which in the following century almost accomplished the ruin of the kingdom.

In 1351, John created the first order of the court, that of the *Étoile*, which supplied the model for the Order of the Golden Fleece, created in 1439 by the Duke of Burgundy. True chivalry departed when the kings undertook the creation of an official chivalry.

CHAPTER XXX

CHARLES V. THE WISE (1364–1380)

Charles V. (1364–1380): Restoration of Order in the Realm and in the Finances.—The house of Valois, which had not yet rendered any services to the state, had cost it dear; two great defeats, a condition of misery and a shameful treaty which threw back the development of France a century and a half. But it now gave France in exchange a prince who merited his surname of the Wise. Charles was then twenty-seven. His previous conduct had not been such as to raise great hopes. As a warrior, he had acquired an evil reputation at Poitiers, where he had been one of the first to take to flight; as a statesman, he had shown no better at Paris during the revolution. The weakness of his health and even of his moral character did not suggest

that he was a man able to repair the disasters of the previous reign. "He understood Latin thoroughly and was well enough acquainted with the rules of grammar. From the moment of his accession, he sent through the land to seek out and summon to him learned clerks and philosophers skilled in the mathematical and speculative sciences."

This weak and sickly king, who passed his life shut up in his Hôtel St. Pol or at the château of Vincennes, surrounded by solemn clerks and astrologers, appeared to be a man little suited to an age when there was war on every side and in which the lance and sword were so necessary. But in addition to the wise men and philosophers who surrounded the king, other figures were associated with him, a veritable school of captains, the two illustrious Bretons, Bertrand Du Guesclin and Oliver de Clisson; Boucicault, Louis de Châlons, Le Bègue de Vilaines, Edouard de Renty, the lords of Beaujeu, Pommiers, and Reyneval. They were not the knights paladin of the earlier age; they knew how to give vigorous sword-thrusts, but that was not the limit of their knowledge. For the first time for many ages in France they understood that there was an art of war. They studied, if not strategy, at least stratagems and abandoned that absurd insistence on supposed points of honour which had caused the disasters of Crecy and Poitiers. They substituted ingenuity, ruses, and even fraud, by these means securing victory and all that victory implied. Charles V. adopted these ideas and employed these generals as he employed his wise men; while the statesmen examined charters, interpreted treaties, discussed and negotiated, the soldiers, under the direction of the king, who guided them from his cabinet, waged a war in which there was little glory on the surface, but which was very profitable in actual fact and of which the result was the eventual territorial reconstruction of the kingdom.

The Treaty of Bretigny had not brought the war to an end. Charles the Bad resumed the prosecution of his claims and his demands for pecuniary grants; the Bretons continued their war of succession, which had lasted for more than twenty years, and the kingdom was terribly wasted by the great companies. Charles V. dealt with each of these difficult matters in turn.

Struggle with the King of Navarre.—The possessions of Charles the Bad in Normandy were a source of great uneasiness to the king. With his two towns of Mantes and Meulan, the King of Navarre barred the passage of the Seine and was able to bring the English into the heart of France. Charles V. determined to

deprive his rival of them, and the war which followed was waged on the same principle as was adopted in all the wars of this reign.

One morning Boucicault, with nine companions, presented himself at the gates of Nantes, as if in terror and pursued; he asked the burghers to open their gates to him, saying that the brigands of the Rolleboise had defeated and were following him, and would spare neither Navarrese nor French. The burghers doubted the story, but Boucicault reassured them, giving them his word of honour; he was permitted to enter the town. More and more pretended fugitives arrived, until they were in such numbers that they declared the town taken, and seized the gates, crying, "Saint Yves Guesclin," and began to kill and mutilate the inhabitants. A similar exhibition of treachery delivered Meulan to the French, and the treatment inflicted upon the credulous burghers was the same.

Du Guesclin: Battle of Cocherel (1364): Treaty with Charles the Bad (1365).—Charles of Navarre, to avenge himself, sent an army of Navarrese into Normandy, accompanied by English and Gascons and under the command of Jean de Grailly, Sieur de Buch. On the other hand, Du Guesclin also entered the province with a mixed force of men-at-arms and starving archers. His army had had nothing but bread to eat for two days. In order to induce them to attack, Grailly covered a table with wines, hams, and every kind of food, but not a Frenchman left his ranks, and the Navarrese were forced to await the onslaught on a hill, on which they were cleverly posted not far from Cocherel. The knights of Crecy and Poitiers would at once have delivered a frontal attack; Du Guesclin did likewise, but after a preliminary encounter, he caused the retreat to sound and feigned flight. At this sight, the English commander, John Joel, despite Grailly's orders, charged into the plain, shouting, "St. George to the fore: let who loves him follow." Grailly would not abandon him and followed. Du Guesclin had expected this mistake; he turned and fell heavily on the enemy. He had prepared another ruse of war. Thirty knights, the bravest in his force, mounted on the thirty best horses, were instructed to devote all their attention to the capture of Grailly. Recognising him as, battle-axe in hand, he fought on foot at the head of his men, they all hurled themselves on him, captured him, and withdrew at a gallop. This exploit, and the fact that John Joel was mortally wounded, decided the day (May 16, 1364). Du Guesclin had promised Charles this prize;

by it Charles the Bad was induced to treat and to accept the essential condition offered him by the King of France, that he should exchange his Norman fiefs for the barony of Montpellier, where he would be out of touch with the English.

End of the Breton War: Battle of Auray: Treaty of Guérande (1365).—War still continued in Brittany. In 1350, the struggle had been marked by a celebrated feat of arms, the fight of the thirty. Robert de Beaumanoir, governor of the castle of Josselin, defied Richard Bramburg, an Englishman who commanded the castle of Ploermel. They met on the shore near Josselin, each with twenty-nine companions. The fight was long and bloody. Beaumanoir, wounded early in the combat and suffering from thirst, demanded something to drink. One of his comrades, Geoffrey Dubois, cried, "Drink your blood, Beaumanoir," and went on with the fight. Four Frenchmen and nine English, Bramburg among the latter, were killed, and almost all the others on both sides were wounded. The English surrendered to the French.

Such exploits hardly advanced the general situation, and the war dragged on until the Battle of Auray (1364). The Kings of France and England had reserved to themselves the right of assisting the two claimants to the duchy without breaking the truce between them. In virtue of this remarkable provision, the King of France placed at the service of Charles of Blois a thousand lances and his most able commander, Bertrand Du Guesclin. The English declined to remain passive, and the Prince of Wales supplied John of Montfort with 200 lances, thirty archers, and a good number of knights under the brave and prudent Chandos. A battle took place at Auray. The English and Montfort occupied a hill near Cocherel, a position similar to that at Poitiers. Du Guesclin was not so rash as to attack them in such a position, but Charles of Blois was resolved to fight. The Breton lords were anxious to end this long rivalry, and had resolved that if Charles of Blois were found, he should not be held to ransom but killed. The French party had come to a similar resolve with regard to John of Montfort, in order that the war might be ended by this battle.

Being compelled to fight, Du Guesclin disposed his men so well that the English commander could not conceal his admiration. "God help me," he cried, "truly there is here the flower of chivalry, good sense, and good equipment." Chandos was also an able leader, and in addition to the advantage which the position gave him, he had placed a force in reserve to assist his men

if they began to give way. This precaution ensured his victory: despite all his courage and prudence, Du Guesclin was taken prisoner and was only ransomed at the cost of 100,000 livres, the equivalent of six million francs. Charles of Blois, with his chief supporters, was killed. The defeat did not produce very serious consequences. The king negotiated and by the Treaty of Guérande (April 11, 1365) John of Montfort was recognised as Duke of Brittany, the widow of Charles of Blois being granted the county of Penthièvre and the viscounty of Limoges. John IV., though he had been restored by English arms, came to Paris (December, 1366), and did homage to Charles V., his chancellor declaring on his behalf that he did such homage as his predecessors, the dukes of Brittany, had been wont to do to the kings of France, leaving it undecided whether that homage was or was not liege homage, whether the duke did or did not owe the king service towards and against all men.

The Grand Companies: French Intervention in Castille.—As hostilities ceased in Normandy and Brittany, another scourge made itself felt, as the grand companies were increased by all the disbanded soldiers. Driven from the frontier provinces where the people were more energetic and united, the adventurers turned towards the heart of the kingdom, to which they all hastened, so that they called the kingdom of France their chamber. In order to free the land, a crusade was suggested and the King of Hungary offered to take them into his service against the Turks. But the grand companies found the journey to Hungary too long and returned home. Another expedition made a greater appeal to them. Castille groaned under the tyranny of Pedro the Cruel, who had poisoned his wife, Blanche of Bourbon, sister-in-law of the French king. When, therefore, Pedro's natural brother, Henry of Trastamara, demanded the protection of France, Charles V., to aid him in the overthrow of his brother, offered him the grand companies under the command of Bertrand Du Guesclin, who had been released from captivity. The expedition assumed the character of a crusade. There was talk of an advance to Granada and of the expulsion of the Moors. It was alleged that Pedro was certainly the son of a Jew; his mother was said to have exchanged her daughter for the child of a Jewess and in proof of this it was declared that all the conduct of Pedro was Jewish and that the Jews in his realm enjoyed a disgraceful degree of credit. War against such a man was clearly a crusade, and in order to begin their expedition religiously, the grand companies went to Avignon, and exacted

from the pope a general absolution, his blessing, and the sum of 200,000 francs.

No fighting occurred. Pedro was abandoned by all, and took refuge first with the Moors at Granada and then in Portugal. Thence he went to Bordeaux where he asked the English to assist him to regain his throne, promising to cede to the Black Prince the province of Biscay and to pay him 600,000 florins, which he had concealed in safe places. "To this news, the prince's knights listened eagerly, for the English and Gascons are very greedy by nature."

The Prince of Wales recalled to his standard the English and Gascon adventurers who were serving with Du Guesclin, crossed the Pyrenees at the head of a numerous army, and reached the Ebro without difficulty. But it was hard to live in these desolate provinces, and had Henry been wise enough to avoid battle, the English host would soon have perished from hunger. But despite the prayers of Du Guesclin it was decided to attack the invaders, Henry crying, "By my father's soul, I desire to see this prince and to measure my strength with his, so that we will not part without a battle." An engagement took place near Najara (April 3, 1367), the superiority of the English archers and the ability of John Chandos assured the Black Prince and his ally a victory which the French disputed for a time. Du Guesclin was again taken prisoner; Henry of Trastamara was expelled, Don Pedro was restored; and the Prince of Wales found himself master of a great part of Spain, as, after Poitiers, he had been master of a great part of France.

Difficulties of the Black Prince in Guienne.—After this victory the difficulties of the English were renewed. It was necessary to find means of livelihood, and everything was lacking. The treasures which Pedro had boastfully promised probably did not exist, and having no other provisions, the English ate greedily of the fruits of the country, with the result that the health of the nobles was ruined. The heat and the climate of Spain did their work; the prince himself became weary and ill. He resolved to recross the mountains, to regain the fertile land of Guienne. But the Gascons, who had made the campaign in hope of a rich reward, loudly demanded their pay. Being unable to give them money the prince was forced to demand it. He assembled the States of the province at Niert and announced to them the levy of a hearth tax of ten shillings on each hearth. The States answered that they would not pay it, and maintained this refusal, though the tax was removed to Angoulême, Poitiers, and Bergerac.

Dissension arose between the two parties. "The nature of the men of Poitou, Saintonge, Quercy, Limousin, and Rouergue was such that they could not love the English, and the English on their side, being proud and presumptuous, could not love them, but instead despised and hated them."

The Gascon Nobles appeal to the King of France (1369).—The Gascons went farther than their refusal to pay taxes. The Counts of Armagnac, Périgord, and Comminges, the Sieur d'Albret, and many other barons of the district went to Paris and laid an appeal before Charles V. against the conduct of the Prince of Wales. The appeal was heard, and at the beginning of 1369 a criminal judge and a knight of Beauce came to Bordeaux to present to the Black Prince the following summons from the king: "Charles, by the grace of God, King of France, to his nephew, the Prince of Wales and Aquitaine, greeting. As so many prelates, barons, knights, universities, communes, and colleges of the marches and borders of Gascony have now come to our court to seek redress for certain grievances and undue evils which you proposed to inflict upon them, therefore, to avoid and to remedy these things, we have discussed with them and heard them, and now command you that you come to our city of Paris and appear in our chamber of peers, to hear right concerning the said complaints, and that you make no default, and that you come as soon as you are able after receiving these letters." "We will willingly go to Paris," answered the prince, "since the King of France has sent for us, but it shall be with helm on head and 60,000 men in our train." Charles V., as if he had no intention of breaking the truce, sent to Edward III., in proof of friendship, fifty pipes of wine. The English bravely refused them; clearly war was inevitable.

Prudent Conduct of Charles V.: Adventurous Policy of Edward III.—It was the fact that he was ready for war while his enemies were not, that had given the cautious Charles this boldness and induced him to take so decisive a step. A wise economy had allowed him in 1367 to reduce the *gabelle* on salt by one half, to remit to the peasants half the taxes and to the burghers a quarter, on condition that they employed the money which the king left them in the fortification of their towns. He had organised in various strong places bodies of burgher archers, who, while unable to resist the English archers in the open field, would be capable of rendering good service from the height of their walls. Finally, in 1369, he had amassed enough money in his treasury, produced enough order in his kingdom, and created enough

discipline in his army to dare to renew the war. Edward III., on the other hand, wished only to rest on his laurels, and had thrown himself into adventures which dissipated his resources and increased the number of his enemies. He treated Scotland with an insulting contempt, and revived on behalf of his son Edmund those claims to Flanders which had been made for the Black Prince in the days of Artevelde; he maintained a hateful tyrant in Castille, and by his possession of Biscay menaced Spanish independence.

Successful Foreign Policy of Charles V.—Charles V. carefully revived that ancient and valuable alliance between France and Scotland which the two peoples declared had already lasted six hundred years. He married his brother, Philip the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, to the heiress of some German provinces, as he preferred a prince of his own blood to one of English blood in those territories. He also won over the King of Navarre, whose attitude had so far been undecided, and in Castille he overthrew the protégé of England, Pedro the Cruel. Du Guesclin accomplished this last revolution. He was at Bordeaux, weary of his captivity, when the Black Prince one day met him and said, "How do you fare, Bertrand?" "Wonderfully, sire," answered Du Guesclin, "for it is said that I am the foremost knight in the world, since you do not dare to put me to ransom." The prince, piqued, at once offered Du Guesclin the fixing of his own ransom, and the Breton put it at 100,000 livres. "And where will you raise it, Bertrand?" "The King of Castille will pay one half and the King of France the other, and if that do not suffice, there is not a farmer's wife in France who will not pluck a fowl to pay my ransom." Charles V. sent Du Guesclin to Spain, where he defeated Pedro at the Battle of Montiel (March 14, 1369) and restored to the throne Henry of Trastamara, who in return placed the Castillian fleet at the disposal of France.

This reign of skilful alliances made the time ripe for France to tear up the disgraceful Treaty of Bretigny. Charles felt that the moment had come when he might insult the English; he caused his defiance to be borne to England by a varlet of his kitchen, who delivered the letter to Edward at Westminster in full parliament.

Confiscation of Guienne.—In order to give legal colour to his proceedings, Charles assembled the States-General at Paris (May 9, 1369) and submitted to them the dispute between himself and the King of England. He showed himself affable and gracious, telling the States that if he had done too little or too

much, they should tell him truly. They were in cordial agreement with him. The court of peers, consulted in their turn, declared that as Edward and his son had not appeared before them the duchy of Aquitaine and the other lands which they held in France ought to be confiscated.

English Invasion (1369): Another System of Warfare.—The English landed at Calais. A powerful French army, under the Duke of Burgundy, went to meet them, but avoided all pitched battles and retired as the invaders advanced. The towns were well fortified and well defended, and the English could not take one; their expedition degenerated into useless ravaging of the open land. In 1370 they returned, but the same plan was unfalteringly followed. The prohibition on fighting was so definite and so rigorously observed that at Noyon, when an enemy knight passed the barriers of the town crying, "Sirs, I have come to see you; you dare not go outside your barriers and I dare to enter them," he was allowed to depart safe and sound. There was the same passive resistance at Reims and Paris. From the Hôtel St. Pol, where he remained shut up, the king saw the burning villages, but the brave Clisson himself said, "Sire, do not use your men against these madmen: let them wear themselves out. They will not deprive you of your heritage with all this smoke." To fulfil a vow, an Englishman came up to the Faubourg St. James and planted his lance in the gate; the knights who guarded the barrier applauded his boldness and allowed him to go free. But a butcher could not bear this shame; he ran after the Englishman and killed him with a stroke of an axe.

Last Expedition of the Black Prince: Sack of Limoges (1370).—"There has never been a King of France who has armed himself less, and never one who has given me more trouble," said Edward III. In truth, Charles V., sickly and delicate, never took lance in hand; he preferred to be among his books. He had the best library of the period, 910 volumes, carefully guarded in a tower of the Louvre with chains of iron. Each year the king read the whole Bible; he wrote to the pope and sent him presents, he walked in pious processions with the queen, dishevelled and barefoot. A prince so friendly with the pope and so pious deserved to have all the bishops of the kingdom as his allies, and the majority did open the gates of their towns to this good King of France. Even those upon whom the English most counted, such as the Bishop of Limoges, the friend of the Prince of Wales, "turned French," as the saying was.

This last treason angered the English. The Black Prince swore by his father's soul that he would not rest until he had taken Limoges and made the traitors pay dearly for their treason. When he arrived before the place, he caused part of the walls to be breached and through this opening his soldiers poured into the streets. The prince himself was borne forward in a litter. Men, women, and children fell on their knees before him, praying for mercy, but he paid no attention and heard no cry, giving them all up to the sword, more than 3000 persons being massacred.

The violence of the English was only calmed by the interest they took in a combat between three French knights and the Duke of Lancaster and the Earls of Cambridge and Pembroke. The Prince of Wales caused his litter to be stopped that he might enjoy this spectacle and he allowed the three knights to be granted quarter. He even pardoned the bishop, the chief author of the treason. This sad exploit was the last achievement of the Black Prince (1370); he languished some years longer and then went home to die in England (1376).

Decisive Success of Charles V.—The English possessed an excellent infantry in their archers whose arrows could pierce the best armour, and in their men-at-arms who were almost equal to a regular cavalry owing to their spirit of discipline and their skill in manœuvring. To oppose these forces, Charles had only a vast crowd of nobles, who were brave but wholly undisciplined. Prudence counselled the avoidance of pitched battles, but in the intervals between great expeditions the king was quite willing that his knights should break some lances, and especially the brave Du Guesclin, who had been recalled from Spain after the Battle of Montiel and made constable. He defeated Robert Knollys, one of the most famous English captains, at Pont-Valain (1370), and gained another success at Chizez in Poitou (1373). Chandos had already been killed in the first campaign, and another leader of great renown, the Captal[1] de Buch, was taken near Soubise (1372). From this time the French made consistent progress.

The king had a war of his own, and the bulletins of his victories are inscribed in the Collection of Ordinances. Thus, under the date 1370, the following entries appear: "February: Letters patent permitted the inhabitants of Rodez to trade throughout the whole kingdom without paying duty for the merchandise which they bought. March: Letters patent permitting the

[1] Chief.

inhabitants of Figeac found within the territory under the control of Edward, son of the English king, to be free from disturbance in their possessions, if they returned to lands under the control of the French king. An ordinance granted privileges to the town of Montauban. April: An ordinance granted privileges to the town of Verfeuil. May: Letters patent exempted the town of Milhaud from taxes for twenty years and an ordinance granted privileges to the town of Tulle. June: Ordinances granted privileges to the people of the county of Tartas, to the town of Dorat, and to the town of Puy-Mirol. July: An ordinance granted privileges to the town of Cahors, to the town of Castres, to the town of Puy-la-Roque, to the town of Sarlat, to the town of Montegrier, and to the town of Salvetat."

Recovery of Poitiers (1372).—In these ordinances are to be found the engines of war employed by Charles V. As for the towns, the gates of which were not opened by royal ordinances, his captains overcame them by their ruses of war, by force and negotiation. Du Guesclin laboured secretly with the people of Poitiers, who, like the people of other towns, had remained French at heart. He entered the town with 300 lances. Charles V. then granted titles of nobility to all who for the future should occupy the office of mayor of Poitiers (1372).

Recovery of La Rochelle (1372).—Bordeaux and La Rochelle were then rival towns, and as the former was English at heart the sympathies of the latter were for the opposing party. An English garrison of a hundred men, under Philip Mansel, held La Rochelle. One day when Mansel was dining with the mayor, John Caudourier, a letter arrived from the King of England. The governor recognised the royal seal, but that was all that he could do, for he could not read. He therefore asked his host to read it for him and the mayor in a loud voice read a message which he had composed on the spur of the moment and which conveyed to Mansel an order that on the following day (August 15, 1372) the garrison should be reviewed with the burghers in the public square. While Mansel withdrew his men from the castle, in conformity with this order, a force placed in ambush by the mayor behind the old walls of the town cut off his retreat. He was obliged to surrender the citadel, and Du Guesclin, with two hundred lances, appeared to take possession in the name of the King of France. Some weeks before, a Castillian fleet had defeated an English fleet before La Rochelle.

Renewed and Fruitless English Invasion (1373).—None the

less the obstinate enemy reappeared (1373). Landing at Calais with 30,000 men, the Duke of Lancaster believed that he could conquer France; he only passed through it. His march was successful while he was in the rich northern provinces, but in the poor and barren districts of the centre, privation and sickness began. In Auvergne not a horse remained to him; at Bordeaux he had only 6000 men left, and knights and common soldiers alike begged their bread from door to door.

The English almost expelled from France (1380).—The English were now disgusted with this type of warfare. They did not renew the invasion in the following year, and in 1375 they demanded a truce which was prolonged until the death of Edward III. (1377). Charles then broke the truce and struck his blow. He set five armies on foot and conquered all Guienne, while a Castillian fleet, carrying French troops, ravaged the coasts of Kent and Sussex. In 1380 Bayonne, Bordeaux, and Calais, with Brest and Cherbourg, alone remained to the English.

Unsuccessful Attempt of Charles against Brittany (1378).—Charles attempted to repeat in Brittany the success which he gained in Guienne. He summoned Duke John to appear before his court of peers (June 20, 1378), and when the duke did not appear, his duchy was declared forfeit to the royal demesne. The Gascons had surrendered themselves to France; the Bretons would not allow themselves to be taken. Barons, knights, and squires signed a confederation at Rennes (April 26, 1379), to which the burghers themselves subscribed. John IV., who had been lately expelled from his duchy, was recalled. All the Bretons in the service of France, a considerable number, abandoned it, and even those who had promised to support the designs of Charles turned against him. The aged Du Guesclin handed back the constable's sword, and a treaty of alliance was signed (March 1, 1380) between England and Brittany at Westminster. Once more an English army landed at Calais; it was commanded by the Earl of Buckingham and passed through northern France with impunity. It had not yet reached Brittany when Charles died at Vincennes (September 16, 1380).

Du Guesclin preceded the king to the tomb by two months. He died under the walls of the castle of Randon; its English governor had promised to surrender it if help did not arrive, but when the warrior was dead he regarded himself as absolved from his oath. Marshal Sancerre at once assembled the hostages before the walls to execute them; the English let down the drawbridge and offered him the keys of the place. Sancerre

refused them. "Your treaty was made with the lord Bertrand," he said, "and you shall surrender to him without delay." They were then led to the house where the corpse of Du Guesclin lay and the keys were laid on the bier.

Cession of Walloon Flanders.—Another error of the king lost a province, though this was of his own free will. In 1369, in order to hasten the marriage of his brother, the Duke of Burgundy, with the heiress of the Count of Flanders, he abandoned French Flanders to him. Charles exacted a promise that the province should be restored after the death of the duke's father-in-law, but the Count of Flanders survived Charles V., and Philip the Bold easily secured release from his promise from Charles VI. Lille was lost to France for three centuries, until the reign of Louis XIV.

Administration: Permanence of Parliament.—The conquests of Charles were the result of a perseverance which never failed him, of his strict economy, of financial probity which had not before been known, and which prevented recourse to the disastrous methods of debasement, and finally to those beneficial regulations for the government of the state which earned for him the surname of the Wise. He made parliaments permanent instead of occasional, and handed over to them the old palace of St. Louis, which thenceforth became the Palais de Justice.

Ordinances relating to the Majority of the Kings and to Royal Appanages.—An ordinance of Charles V., which remained the law of the monrachy until the Revolution, fixed the majority of the French kings at the completion of the thirteenth year. Another ordinance separated the regency from the custody of the royal person, so that the two might never be held by the same person, and a third, in order to prevent the dismemberment of the demesne, gave to the king's children pensions in place of appanages, 12,000 livres secured on land; 40,000 francs to the eldest son, 100,000 to the eldest daughter, and 60,000 to the others.

Favour shown to the Burghers: Further Reduction of the Privileges of the Nobles.—The town corporations had begun to menace industrial society as the communes had once menaced political society, and Charles V. attempted to establish the freedom of industry. An ordinance (September, 1358) laid down that all who could do good work should be allowed to practise their trade in Paris. But custom was too strong for the law, and the project was abandoned, not to be revived until the time of Turgot. In 1370, at the moment of the last breach with England,

an ordinance authorised the burghers of Paris to wear gold spurs and the ornaments of knights, to whom they were permitted to marry their daughters. The ideas of a king little favourable to feudalism here appeared, and were still further illustrated by another ordinance which granted nobility to the provosts and sheriffs of the city. The same king who ennobled the burghers of his own accord caused a number of castles to be destroyed on the ground that they served as places of refuge for the English. He also permitted open resistance to those who tried to exercise the right of seizure contrary to the ordinances, that is, who did not pay for the provisions which they took and the carts which they used. He also succeeded in depriving the nobles of such sovereign prerogatives as had remained to them, by reserving to the king all legislative power. An ordinance of 1372 gave to the crown the exclusive right to issue charters to communes or burghers, or to ennoble them. The monarchy had already taken from the barons the right of private war, of coining money, and of final judgment. Their regalian rights, in short, had been taken from them, but there still remained to them, until they also could be suppressed, their administrative and military powers, which the king used and which he subordinated to his supreme authority.

Increase and Permanence of Indirect Taxation.—In the reign of this restorer of society there were some shadows. Both as regent and king, Charles stifled every expression of liberty. For his wars, his building, and his negotiations he needed money in abundance and he increased taxation; if the permanence of the ground rent or *taille* is due to his grandson, that of indirect taxation or *aides* was due to him. It is just to add that the *aides* fell on all articles of consumption and thus indirectly on every one, on the noble and the clerk no less than on the peasant. But Charles was the first to compel every family to buy from the royal farmers the amount of salt which was supposed to be needed by them, without reference to whether they were able to dispose of this onerous acquisition. In place of himself paying the members of the parliament, he gave them as salary the fines which they imposed. This was not calculated to increase respect for justice.

Collectors and Generals of Finance.—An institution which lasted until 1789 is traced to this reign. The States of 1356-1357 instituted commissioners-general and under them collectors for the assessment and receipt of taxation. Charles V. preserved these officials, who became royal functionaries instead of being

chosen by the people. In course of time their numbers were increased and the districts over which they had control acquired the names of *pays d'election* and *généralties*. The elected officials supervised the assessment and collection of taxes and were judges in the case of financial disputes, while the generals of finance judged such cases in the last resort. The last named formed the court of *aides* which received its final constitution from Charles VII.

Public Works : Encouragement of Learning.—Charles V., despite his economy, was a great builder. He began the Bastille, repaired and extended the walls of Paris and the Louvre of Philip Augustus, built the Hôtel St. Pol, of which the gardens went down to the Seine, and the châteaux of Beauté, Plaisance, and Melun, the actual chapel of Vincennes, and other public works. He wished to unite the Loire and Seine by a canal, an idea which was realised two centuries later by Henry IV. He encouraged letters, caused the Bible to be translated, as well as the works of Aristotle, St. Augustine, and Livy, he inspired the writing by Bonnor of the *Arbre des Batailles*, the first treatise on the law of peace and war, and by Raoul de Presle or Charles Louviers the *Songe du Verger*, a work in which the author tried to define the limits of royal and papal authority. He formed a collection of 910 volumes, which was the beginning of the royal library, and created colleges of astronomy and medicine at Paris.

Froissart.—Among the men of letters of this reign, Froissart has not been mentioned, both because he was not, like the others, of the royal household and because he deserves separate notice. He was a Fleming, born at Valenciennes about 1337 and died in 1410, having passed his life at the courts of princes and nobles in England and France, their purses paying for the works preserved to us. His book is one of the most precious monuments of the French language and history, but is marked neither by the highest morality nor by the most profound patriotism. He favoured those who could best handle the lance, and his age was with him in this. The historian of Charles V. was a woman, Christina of Pisa, daughter of the royal astrologer, whose style was not naïf and brilliant as that of Froissart, but whose story, though less well told, is marked by more thought. With her, history tends to degenerate into chronicles, and her book, very inferior to those of Froissart and Comines, marks the transition from the one to the other.

Moral Decadence of the Fourteenth Century.—Despite Frois-

sart and despite the king's letters, the age was still a period of profound moral decadence, a time during which the progress of the world was stayed; there were no more great thoughts or wise doctors; intellectual and moral power alike decayed. The Middle Ages had already reached the point where they fall into oblivion, and where it becomes obvious that they have served their purpose.

The Great Schism.—The dual election of Urban VI. and Clement VII. in 1378 began, two years before the death of Charles V., the schism of the west, which lasted for seventy-eight years, dividing the allegiance of Christendom and preparing the way for the Reformation. France, and especially the University of Paris, made the most praiseworthy efforts to restore unity and peace to the Church.

Discoveries of the Dieppe Sailors in Africa.—During this reign, and thus long before the Portuguese, the men of Dieppe, then a great seat of commerce, discovered the coast of Guinea in Africa, whence they brought back pepper, gold-dust, and ivory. Carving in ivory is to the present day a special industry at the town of Dieppe.

St. Ouen of Rouen.—The magnificent abbey church of St. Ouen at Rouen also dates from this reign. In its architecture, which in civil construction had become burdened by caprice, it still preserved that severe tradition, the inheritance of the thirteenth century, which was found in all religious work.

Female Peers.—By letters of 1378, the Duchess of Orleans excuses herself for not taking her seat as a peer in the parliament. The Countess Mahaut of Artois assisted at the coronation of Philip V. and with other peers held the crown on the king's head.

CHAPTER XXXI

CHARLES VI. (1380–1422)

The Royal Family.—Charles V. was only forty-three when he died, and his death was a calamity for his country, as he left only a son of twelve. This child was forced to rely on his uncles, the Dukes of Anjou, Burgundy, and Berry, greedy princes, the first of whom was engaged in his claim to Naples, Queen Joanna having named him her heir; the second in the great fief of Flanders, to which he had become heir; and the third in his pleasures and riches. Charles VI. had another uncle on his

mother's side, the Duke of Bourbon, an excellent prince but devoid of influence; and a brother, the Duke of Orleans.

Rapine by the King's Uncles.—During the death agony of Charles V., the Duke of Anjou, his eldest brother, to whom the title of regent belonged, remained hid in a neighbouring room. As soon as the king was dead the duke caused the crown jewels to be handed over to him, and by threatening the treasurer, Savoisy, with death, secured also a treasure of gold and silver bars which had been cemented like stones in the walls of the château of Melun by masons who had afterwards been put to death. The year before, being Governor of Languedoc, the duke had excited a revolt by his rapine; in Montpellier alone he had condemned 200 citizens to be executed, 200 to the gallows, 200 to be burned, 1800 to forfeiture of their goods, and the rest of the town to a fine of 600,000 francs. The king had modified this terrible sentence and had recalled the duke. It was to such a prince that the regency fell. His brothers, like him, filled their hands. The Duke of Burgundy adjudged to himself the government of Normandy and Picardy; the Duke of Berry took Languedoc and Aquitaine, having already Berry, Auvergne, and Poitou; thus a third of the kingdom was given over to his rapacity.

The accession of a new king is always a time of hope. The abolition of certain taxes was demanded, and the duke promised to do away with all which had been established since the time of Philip the Fair. It was equivalent to a promise that France should no longer be governed, but the regent was not expected to keep his word. One day a public crier appeared on horseback in the great square and announced that the royal treasury had been robbed, and promised a large reward to any one who discovered the thief. When he saw the crowd struck by this news, he cried that on the next day a new tax would be levied on all merchandise sold, and then saved himself by galloping away.

Risings in Paris, Rouen, and Languedoc: Maillotins and Tuchins.—The next day (March 1, 1382), the collectors appeared at the market. One of them began to demand the tax on a little watercress which an old woman offered for sale. A furious riot ensued. The rebels ran to the Hôtel de Ville and the arsenal, and seized as arms the new mallets which they found stored there in view of an English invasion. The *maillotins* were for a time master of the town, but then, as was the case with all popular outbreaks of that period, fury made way for terror and discouragement. The princes, who had recovered their ascendancy, caused the most seditious to be privately executed and imposed ruinous

fines on the rest, with the proceeds of which the Duke of Anjou left for Italy. But the new tax was withdrawn and the rioters were only punished by confiscations. This revolt at Paris was rapidly imitated in the towns of Rouen, Reims, Châlons, Troyes, Orleans, and Sens, and was the match which fired two other insurrectionary outbreaks which began in Flanders in the north and in Languedoc in the south.

The Duke of Berry had hardly appeared in his government of Languedoc when war broke out against him. The pope intervened and a truce was effected, but the pope was unable to check the exactions and cruelty of the prince. The peasants, robbed by his soldiers, began a kind of *Jacquerie*, taking refuge in the mountains, more especially in the Cevennes, and thence organising armed bands which fell upon the nobles and gave no quarter to those whose hands were not hardened by manual labour. They were known as the *tuchins*.

War of Flanders: Battle of Roosebeke (1382).—The revolt of Flanders was even more serious. The Flemings had risen at the close of the previous reign against their French count, who seemed to take a delight in violating municipal privileges. Peter Dubois and Philip Artevelde, son of the famous brewer, had successfully directed a rising of the White Hoods, and the Battle of Bruges (May 3, 1382) had destroyed the last hopes of Count Louis. Philip Artevelde guided the revolution with the same spirit and in the same direction as his father had done ; deputies with full powers from the towns of Ghent, Ypres, and Bruges appeared at the court of Richard II. and offered to recognise him as King of France if he would assist them.

It seemed that for twenty-five years the spirit of revolt was vigorous in the burgher class throughout Europe. The rising of Rienzi in Rome, of Wat Tyler in England, of the *Jacquerie*, Marcel, the *maillotins*, *tuchins*, White Hoods, followed one another. As soon as insurrection was stifled in one direction it broke out in another, and there was ground for Froissart's fear that all gentlefolk and nobles would be killed and destroyed in France and everywhere else.

One day as the Dukes of Burgundy and Berry were discussing together the perils of the situation and the need for intervention in Flanders the young king entered with a falcon on his wrist. "What great counsel are you taking, my uncles ?" he asked. The Duke of Berry replied that the Duke of Burgundy was complaining to him of the Flemings who had deprived their lord and his men of their inheritance and who had a captain, Artevelde,

a very Englishman for courage, who was besieging a number of gentlemen at Oudenarde, and who declared that he would not leave the place. "And," added the duke, "he will have his will on the place if your power does not relieve it." The king cried that he was very ready to aid them, and that he wished for nothing better than to arm himself, as he had not yet borne arms, and could not reign with honour until he had done so. He wished to set out the next day or even at once.

A large army was soon ready. At its approach all the towns of Flanders made their submission, and the people of Ghent were left with no alternative but to win a great battle by throwing themselves, as had been done at Bruges, with the violence of a wild boar on the enemy. This they attempted at Roosebeke (November 27, 1382). They advanced in a serried column, that none might retreat, a plan which had served them well at Bruges against a small force. On this occasion, however, the wings of the formidable French army closed upon them and attacked the column, unable to move, on both flanks. The range of the knights' lances was greater than that of the Flemish spears, and the burghers were left with nothing to do but to bear the blows which fell upon them, so that the column was soon reduced to extreme disorder. Twenty-six thousand Flemings were left dead on the field, including almost the whole Ghent force with Artevelde. Flanders was not yet conquered, as Ghent held out for two years, but the nobles had at last avenged the defeat of Courtrai, and to extinguish the very memory of that day, when they left the town where they had lodged fifteen days and had found the banners of those who fell in 1302 hung in the churches, they gave it over to the flames after having sacked it. The Duke of Burgundy removed from the cathedral a magnificent clock which he carried away to Dijon, where it was placed at the south angle of the church of Notre Dame.

Executions at Paris and Rouen.—At Roosebeke, the revolt of Paris had been defeated no less than the revolt of Ghent. The Parisians saw that little leniency was to be expected by them, but they hoped that by showing their strength they might prevent any attempt against them. They went out to meet the king to the number of 20,000 armed men, ranged in battle array on Montmartre. At this news, the lords exclaimed against the proud *canaille*. "They did not come with the great army that served the king in Flanders; they took good care of themselves, and instead of ringing their bells to celebrate our victory, they dare to appear in arms before their king."

Heralds were sent to ask the Parisians, "Where are your chiefs, and who are your captains?" They answered that they had none save the king and the lords. The heralds then asked if the constable and four barons might come to them in safety. "You jest," said the Parisians. "Say that we are ready to receive our orders." The constable came into their midst and asked why they had come out of the town, as it seemed as if they wished to fight against their lord the king. They protested that they had no such desire and never had had, that they wished only to show the king the power of his good city of Paris, as he was young and knew not what they could do for him, if he had need. The constable answered, "That is good, but the king does not wish to see this just now; if you desire the king to come among you, you must go to your homes and lay down your arms." They obeyed.

The king arrived on the following day. The gates were all wide open; he wished to enter by a breach in the walls and caused one to be made. Then, helmet on head, he passed through the streets with his lance in hand and the most terrible expression that his young face could assume. Executions began at once, and the destruction of the liberties of the town. Its franchises, elective magistrates, provost, sheriffs, syndics, *centeniers*, *dizainers* (tithes-men) were abolished; its guilds, corporations, and brotherhoods were suppressed; and the chains which guarded the streets and the arms of the citizens were removed. Men were arrested summarily, tried and hanged out of hand. Three hundred of the richest burghers were drowned, hanged, or beheaded almost without a formal trial. The death of Nicholas the Fleming was specially noted. He was one of those who had followed Marcel on the day of the murder of the marshals twenty-six years before. John Desmarets, one of the negotiators of the Treaty of Bretigny and advocate-general of the parliament, tried himself by vain endeavours to reconcile the two parties. When he was brought to the market where he was to be executed he was urged to beg the king to forgive him. The old man turned and answered nobly, "I have well and loyally served his great-grandfather King Philip, King John, and King Charles, his father; none of these kings ever had occasion to reproach me, nor would this king reproach me if he had been full grown and had the wisdom of full age. I did not think that he would be guilty of such a judgment. I have no cause to ask mercy of him. From God alone do I beg mercy, and I pray Him that He will pardon my sins." (1383.)

The burghers were then assembled and a long list of their misdeeds was read, with the punishments which they deserved. At the moment when terror reached its height, the king's two uncles threw themselves at his feet and cried for leniency. Charles permitted himself to be moved and announced through his chancellor that the punishment due should be commuted into fines. "This was the true purport of this theatrical display," says Mezerai. Paris only escaped by paying 400,000 francs, some twenty millions according to modern values. At Rouen, Reims, Troyes, Châlons, Orleans, Sens, in Auvergne and in Languedoc, there were the same proceedings, and especially the same fines, all of which went, according to Froissart, to the profit of the Dukes of Berry and Burgundy, for they governed the young king.

This blow fell more grievously on the burghers than that of 1359, since the government had then been in the hands of a clever man who set bounds to the feudal reaction, whereas in 1383 the princes had a free hand. The upper ranks of the burghers were decimated, ruined, and when thirty years later the public ills produced a new revolutionary attempt, the higher class could not assume its direction, and that direction fell into the hands of violent men who drenched Paris in blood.

Reunion of Flanders and Burgundy (1384).—In 1384 the Count of Flanders died, and the Duke of Burgundy, his son-in-law, inherited his vast domains. Forthwith the house of Burgundy turned all its attention towards these rich provinces, and as it found further aggrandisement at the expense of the petty German princes, it gradually forgot both the blood ties by which it was bound and France, in which its greatness had begun.

Preparations for an Attack on England (1385) and Expedition against the Duke of Gueldres.—In the following year preparations were made on a vast scale for an attack on England. Fourteen hundred vessels were collected, enough to make a bridge from Calais to Dover. A city of wood was formed in sections that an entrenched camp might be carried with the invaders. But the favourable time for the attempt was allowed to pass, and the project was abandoned. Vast sums had been wasted. Another expedition against the Duke of Gueldres, who in return for an English pension of 4000 livres had defied the French king, cost still more and produced no result (1388).

End of the Government of the King's Uncles (1388).—The voice of public opinion was feeble, but it was yet audible. On his return from the unfortunate German expedition, the king held

a great council at Reims in the hall of the archbishop, where he demanded from those present that, on their allegiance, they should advise him as to the conduct of public affairs. Peter de Montaigu, Cardinal of Laon, spoke, praised the king's qualities, and urged him to begin the exercise of personal power, by directing, without reference to any one, all that concerned war and the management of his household. Others supported the cardinal's view; Charles VI. declared that he would adopt it, and thanked his uncles for the services which they had rendered. He had hardly left Reims when the cardinal was poisoned.

Ministry of the Marmousets (1388–1392).—The former advisers of Charles V., the small men, or *marmousets*, as the great lords disdainfully called them, Oliver de Clisson, Bureau de la Rivière, Le Bègue de Vilaines, John de Novian, John de Montaigu, once more undertook, as ministers of state, the direction of affairs. The new administration was wise, economical, devoted to order at home and peace abroad, but the king was only the more extravagant. The pleasures and distractions of war were denied him; he turned to those of fêtes and tournaments, and the fêtes went on continuously. At one time the occasion was the knighting of the sons of the Duke of Anjou; at another the first entry of Queen Isabella of Bavaria into Paris; or the marriage of the Duke of Orleans to the beautiful Valentina Visconti. The most serious undertakings became occasions for rejoicings. A journey to the southern provinces to end the great schism which distracted the Church and to supervise the disastrous administration of the Duke of Berry was nothing but one great fête, the expense of which was only equalled by the scandal that was caused. The ministers tried to check these disorders or to minimise their effects, economising in the service of the state in order to meet the extravagance of the king, and the state profited by this policy. Paris regained its provost; the burghers gained the right to acquire fiefs as if they had been nobles. The Duke of Berry was deprived of the government of Languedoc, 40,000 of the inhabitants of which had fled to Aragon, and as no other punishment could be inflicted, his treasurer, Bétisac, was executed.

The *marmousets* ruled France for four years, during which time the king's uncles, the greatest men in the land, were excluded from all share in the government. The princes laboured to put an end to this regime, and an Angevin lord, Peter de Craon, the mortal enemy of Clisson, the chief of the *marmousets*,

put his personal hatred at the service of the political antipathies of the aristocracy.

Attack on Clisson (1392).—On June 13, 1392, at the end of a fête given at the Hôtel St. Pol, the constable took leave, very late, of the king and the Duke of Orleans, and with eight servants, two of whom bore torches, made his way to the Rue St. Catherine. There Peter de Craon awaited him, with forty mounted bravadoes, not six of whom knew what they were about to do. As soon as Clisson appeared, Craon's men fell on his servants and put out their torches. Clisson thought at first that it was a jest on the part of the Duke of Orleans, whom he supposed to have followed him, and cried, "Sir, you are young and must be forgiven; these games suit your age." But Craon shouted, "Death, death, Clisson; you are to die." "Who are you that says such words?" asked Clisson. "I am Peter de Craon, your enemy; you have so many times crossed my path that you must now pay the penalty." The constable attempted to defend himself, but he was soon wounded and thrown from his horse. As he fell, his head struck the half-open door of a bakehouse, which gave under the blow, and this saved him. The assassins believed him dead. They had already recognised the constable, and alarmed at having attacked so important a personage they hastened to fly with Craon to the château of Sablé in Maine.

The news of this outrage was brought to the king as he was going to bed. He called his guards, caused torches to be lighted, and went to the bakehouse where Clisson was beginning to recover consciousness. He assured Clisson that no price would be too heavy to avenge this unprovoked and treacherous attack.

Insanity of the King (1392).—Peter de Craon, not believing himself safe at Sablé, took refuge with the Duke of Brittany, who, when summoned by the king to give up the traitor, caused Craon to be hidden and alleged that he knew nothing of the matter. Charles at once gathered an army, swearing that he would not rest until he had punished all these rebellions. The Dukes of Burgundy and Berry tried to hinder the expedition; their hatred for Clisson had increased since they learned his vast wealth, the constable, believing himself to be on the point of death, having made a will in which he disposed of 1,700,000 francs in movables, besides his fiefs and inheritance. But the king paid no attention either to the delays and ill-will of his uncles, or to the fears for his own sanity which were entertained by his doctors. He advanced with his army to Le Mans.

It was the height of summer, during the hottest days of

August. As he was passing through a forest, a man clothed entirely in white seized his bridle, crying, "Stop, noble king, go no farther; you are betrayed." This sudden apparition alarmed the king. A little farther on the page who bore the royal lance fell asleep on his horse; the lance fell and struck a helmet with a loud noise. At this sound of arms, the king turned pale, drew his sword, and cried, "Death to the traitors." He attacked with his naked sword his pages, his escort, of whom he killed four men, and his brother, the Duke of Orleans, who escaped with difficulty.

The king was mad. Some accused those nightmares of the period, the sorcerers; it would have been enough to accuse the king himself. Master for twelve years of that unlimited power which has often driven the most sober-minded mad, he had, at the age of twenty-four, exhausted all the pleasures, all the emotions, from those of debauchery to those of the field of battle. His constitution was ruined, his brain undermined, and a violent shock overturned his reason.

Restoration of the Government of the Princes.—When fears were expressed that the king was the victim of poison or sorcery, the Duke of Berry answered, "No, he is neither poisoned nor bewitched, except by evil counsels." This remark was the death-knell of the *marmousets*. Some days later, Clisson, having demanded from the Duke of Burgundy the pay of the soldiers who had followed the king in the late expedition, the duke looked at him and said, "Clisson, Clisson, you have done nothing but disquiet the realm, for without you it would have been well ruled. In an evil hour you interfered with it. How the devil did you manage to collect finances to such effect that you could make a will leaving 1,700,000 francs? My lord and brother of Berry and I, for all our power, would not be able to do likewise. Leave my presence and let me see you no more, for if it were not for my honour, I would have your other eye gouged out." Clisson hastened to his castle in Brittany, while the parliament declared him guilty of extortion, banished him from the realm, and fined him 100,000 silver marks. Montaigu, warned by this example, took refuge at Avignon, while de la Rivière, Novian, and de Vilaines were taken and imprisoned in the Bastille.

The king's uncles were thus restored to the full possession of power. The *marmousets* had been occupied with attempts to end the great schism; the princes worked for the same end with such success that soon they had three popes instead of two. They signed a truce with England for twenty-eight years

(1396), giving in marriage to Richard II. Isabella, daughter of Charles VI. But in 1399 this valuable alliance was ended by the deposition of the English king.

Crusade of Nicopolis (1396).—The Ottoman Turks were threatening Christendom: Sultan Bajazet had vowed that he would stable his horse on the altar of St. Peter at Rome. A crusade was decreed, but it was placed under the command of the Count of Nevers, a young man of twenty-four, afterwards John Sans-Peur, Duke of Burgundy. Young and old, all equally careless, joyously passed down the Danube, regarding the crusade as a pleasure trip. When they arrived near Nicopolis, Sigismund, King of Hungary, advised them to meet the advanced guards of the Turks with Hungarian infantry and light cavalry, holding the knights in reserve to meet the main body of the Ottoman army which would appear later. But no one was willing to forego the honour of striking the first blow. They all pressed into the first ranks, hurling themselves on the first enemy they saw; worn out and in disorder they reached the summit of a hill, where they were received by the redoubtable Janissaries, who had been organised by Amurath, and who were more than a match for a force out of breath and scattered. Bajazet caused ten thousand prisoners to be killed in his presence, sparing only from this massacre the Duke of Nevers and twenty-four lords whom he put to ransom.

The government of the aristocracy had not been fortunate; its policy discredited it abroad and its divisions weakened the country at home.

Isabella of Bavaria.—Isabella of Bavaria was not fifteen when she came from Germany to France to marry Charles VI. Without parents, without a guide in the midst of a corrupt court, she learned the manners of the country of her adoption more quickly than its language. She cared for nothing except luxury and pleasure. Years failed to render her conduct more regular or her mind more serious. From pleasure she descended to debauchery, and as, when the king became insane, she was charged with the guardianship of his person she used the authority given to her by her sad situation to satisfy her passions, her vices, and her vengeance. It soon appeared how disastrous this foreign queen was to France.

Murder of the Duke of Orleans.—Philip the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, retained his authority until his death in 1404. His son, John the Fearless, wished to inherit his father's influence on the government no less than his estates, but the Duke of Orleans

was disinclined to resign his power to any one. He was all-powerful with the queen and master through her of the king and the dauphin, who was also the head of a brilliant nobility and an accomplished knight himself. Rivalry soon began between them, and this rivalry threatened to develop into civil war even in the heart of Paris. Each of the rivals assembled his men-at-arms and fortified his hotel. A fight was on the verge of occurring when the aged Duke of Berry intervened, brought the Duke of Burgundy to the Duke of Orleans who was lying ill, caused them to embrace, to receive the communion together, and to eat together. This reconciliation took place on November 20, 1407. On the 23rd Louis of Orleans was dead, murdered by John the Fearless.

The duke had plotted this crime for more than four months. He had bought a house in which he wished, so he said, to store wine, corn, and other provisions ; there he hid sixteen assassins. The house was in the Rue Vieille du Temple, near the Barbette gate and on the road which the Duke of Orleans used in going from the palace to his own house. On Wednesday, November 23, at eight in the evening on a very dark night the duke left the Hôtel Montaigu mounted on a mule and having with him only two squires on a single horse, while four or five servants on foot carried torches. Though it was not late, all the shops were shut already. The duke remained behind his men, singing softly and toying with his glove, when the murderers, hidden by the corner of a house, fell on him shouting, "Death, death." The duke cried, "I am the Duke of Orleans." "Him we seek," they answered, striking him. A page tried to cover his master with his own body and was slain. A woman looked out of a window and cried murder ; one of the assassins called to her, "Silence, you hag." Then by the light of the torches she saw coming out of the house which the Duke of Burgundy had bought a great man, covered by a red cap which hid his eyes, and who, by the light of a straw taper, examined the Duke of Orleans to make sure that the blow had not failed as it had done in the case of the constable before. This time the murderers had well earned their wage ; the corpse was veritably hacked to pieces ; the right arm was severed in two places ; the left hand had been cut off and lay some distance away ; the head was cut open from one ear to the other, and the brains were scattered on the road. At this sight the wearer of the red cap said to the others, "Put out all the lights and let us go ; he is quite dead." Fire was set to the house which they had occupied and leaving pitfalls in the way of any

who might follow them, they retired to the Hôtel d'Artois in the Rue Mauconseil.

Next day John the Fearless went, as all the princes, to visit the dead and to sprinkle holy water on him at the church of the White Friars. "Never was a more traitorous murder done in the realm," he said as he gazed upon the corpse. He wept at the funeral and held a corner of the pall. Some days later when the provost of Paris announced to the council that he would discover the criminals if he were allowed to search the houses of the princes, John the Fearless was alarmed, turned pale, and, drawing the Duke of Berry and the King of Sicily aside, said, "I did it; the devil tempted me."

This momentary depression soon passed and the duke formed the resolve of avowing and justifying his crime. Next day he went boldly to the council of the princes, but his uncle, the Duke of Berry, met him at the gate and said, "Fair nephew, do not enter the council just now; I prefer that you should be elsewhere." John fancied that it was proposed to arrest him; he mounted his horse and rode as quickly as possible to his Flemish possessions, where he caused it to be said, preached, and written, that he had only anticipated the plots of the Duke of Orleans. A Franciscan monk, Doctor John Petit, undertook in the following year to show by twelve arguments in honour of the twelve apostles that if the duke had been slain it was for God, since he was a heretic; for the king, since he wished to usurp the throne; and for the commonwealth, since in him the state would have had a tyrant. To this strange *apologia* for murder the Duke of Burgundy added a bloody victory, killing 20,000 burghers of Liége at Hasbain (1408). Having produced so strong an argument in his defence he returned to Paris, promising the people an early abolition of taxes and securing from the king letters of pardon, by which Charles VI. declared that he bore him no ill-will for having put out of the world his brother, the Duke of Orleans (Peace of Chartres, March, 1409). The Duchess of Orleans, the beautiful and gentle Valentine Visconti, at least escaped seeing this shame of her family. The death of her husband killed her. She had taken as her motto, "Nothing is left to me; to me there is nothing worth." She died in 1408, as Juvenal des Ursins tells us, of a broken heart.

Factions of the Burgundians and Armagnacs (1410).—The Duke of Orleans did not deserve many regrets. His administration had been as deplorable as his ways. He had declared war against England, had not followed up the declaration, and had

made the nominal war an excuse for an increase of taxation, the proceeds of which he appropriated. The Duke of Burgundy stoutly opposed the new taxes ; in order to conciliate the people and to lay hands on the rich spoils himself, he sent John de Montaigu, the superintendent of finance, to the scaffold. He restored to the Parisians their former free constitution, the right of electing their provost and of organising themselves into a burgher militia under elective leaders, as well as the right of holding fiefs of nobles with the privileges attaching to this right. He thus became extremely popular, and this popularity he increased by persistently showing a regard for the burghers to which they were not accustomed. The butchers, petty shopkeepers, and the people of the market supplied the main strength of the Burgundian party in Paris. The feudal party did not forgive the duke for relying upon such support, or for having impaired the prestige of the inviolable nobles by killing a prince of the blood, a brother of the king. A considerable faction among the nobles turned against John the Fearless, and the avengers of the Duke of Orleans ranged themselves under the banner of the father-in-law of one of his sons, the Count d'Armagnac, who gave his name to the party (1410). The king was mad, the queen hated and incapable, the chief prince of the blood guilty of an infamous murder ; there was no government save rival factions in arms ; there was war at home and abroad. Such was the condition of France, a condition only remedied by catastrophe.

Civil War.—Between 1410 and 1412 the two factions twice attacked each other and twice concluded a truce ; in November, 1410, there was the Peace of Bicêtre and in July, 1412, the Peace of Bourges. Both parties made advances to the English in order to win over the national enemy to their side. If during these armed struggles there were no great battles there was an infinity of pillaging and murder in the country. At Paris processions were held to pray Heaven to endue the princes with the spirit of peace.

New Intervention of the Burghers of Paris to restore Peace (1410) : The Cabochins.—In this crisis, which recalled the gloomiest days of the reign of John, the burghers, rather than the parliament, which held aloof, took the lead as they had done in 1356. The University of Paris was proud of having recently secured the deposition of two anti-popes, the election of Alexander V., a former doctor of the Sorbonne, and the summoning of a general council for the reform of the Church. The burghers believed that they could pacify the state, as the University hoped that it had pacified Christendom, and secured from Charles VI.

in one of his lucid intervals an order commending all the princes to return to their demesnes and stay there. But some months later the war was renewed. The Armagnacs committed countless atrocities and bade their victims seek vengeance from "the poor fool of a king." The body of citizens demanded that the royal council should entrust the defence of the city to the Count of St. Pol, a friend of the Duke of Burgundy, and he, being distrustful of the leading burghers, attempted to checkmate them by appealing to the masses. He depended on the great and wealthy corporation of the butchers, who were authorised to raise 500 men for the protection of the city. They armed their servants, the slaughtermen, skinners, and the rest, and this turbulent mob, used to bloodshed and slaughter, took as their chief the slaughterer Caboche. For a time they submitted to the guidance of their masters and of the doctors of the University, but then Paris presented a most singular and terrible spectacle. One day the multitude made its way to the residence of the dauphin, forced him to appear on the balcony, and there, by the mouth of their chosen orator, the old surgeon, John of Troyes, forced him to listen to their rebukes. He was told to banish the advisers who encouraged him in bad habits, the companions of his debauches; he was bidden to live a more regular life, to take care of his health and his reason. The butchers undertook to supervise this reformation of morals which they trusted would lead to the reformation of the kingdom. They mounted guard round the Hôtel St. Pol in order to safeguard the king and the Duke of Guienne, and as they heard too often at night the sound of music and dancing, they boldly entered the palace in order to stop it and to enforce decency and regularity. But these rude and violent spirits were not content with words alone. If they had compassion on "that fair child, the dauphin," they declared themselves against those who corrupted him; they dragged them before the parliament that they might be judged and on the way disposed of those who most displeased them.

The Cabochin Ordinance (1413).—Meanwhile the ablest leaders of the party, doctors and lawyers, prepared the great ordinance of 1413 for the repression of abuses. It was known as the Cabochin Ordinance, and its application would have been one of the most salutary measures in the history of the ancient regime. But this great charter of reform, the united work of the city and the University, though it found men who could conceive it, found none who could carry it out. The wise men and those skilled in the affairs of state had neither the will nor the necessary

political energy; they held aloof, and the movement fell into the hands of the extremists and the turbulent. By their intolerable excesses, these hastened a reaction which led to their fall and to the abandonment of reform.

Reaction: The Armagnacs at Paris.—The mob had violated that which the burghers respected; they proscribed not only vice and immorality but wealth; they mingled pillage and murder with reform. They finally disgusted even those who had at first employed them and who came to blush for their association with them, preferring the Armagnacs to the Cabochins. Summoned by all moderate men, the Armagnacs checked the excesses of the mob, but they also undid the reformation of the burghers (September 5, 1413). John the Fearless had hastily retired to his Flemish provinces; the victorious party pursued him and forced him to promise not to return to Paris (Treaty of Arras, September, 1414).

Battle of Agincourt (1415).—While the Burgundians and Armagnacs were fighting, Henry V. of England judged the moment ripe for intervention in the struggle. He had need to secure by a foreign war the throne which his father had usurped. Remembering the great booty of a former century, war with France was always popular in England. When Henry proposed a serious expedition, he easily obtained 6000 men-at-arms and 24,000 archers, with whom he landed near Harfleur (August 14, 1415). After a heroic defence which lasted for a month, Harfleur, left without help, was forced to surrender. But Henry V. had lost 15,000 men, almost half his army. Too weak to attempt anything, he resolved to reach Calais by a march across country, and to hurl a fresh and insolent defiance at the French chivalry.

The English left Harfleur on October 8, 1415. They crossed the district of Caux not without some opposition, though they were careful only to demand wine and food from the towns in order not to rouse the population against them. They reached Abbeville on the 13th, hoping to cross the Somme, but found the fort of Blanchetaque so well guarded that they had to advance up the river as far as Amiens. Near Nesle a countryman showed them a ford across a marsh, a difficult and dangerous passage. They would have been lost if they had been attacked while making this crossing, but the French army was far in their rear, while the nobles were not anxious for a fight in a marsh. They desired a pitched battle in open country, and the princes demanded from Henry that he should name the place and day. The English king replied shortly that there was no need to name

either a day or a place, as they could meet him any day in the open field.

Despite this answer, there was some fear in the French army that the enemy would escape, and to ensure that he should be held, the princes posted themselves between the villages of Tramecour and Agincourt, in a narrow passage through which the English were bound to pass. The ground was newly ploughed and sodden with rain, and it was impossible for 50,000 men, of whom 14,000 were knights, to deploy and to manœuvre there. The Constable d'Albret disposed his army in three columns, but every one wished to be in the first column; the princes and the chief nobles placed themselves in it and it was more than thirty-two ranks deep. There were some thousand archers to meet the English bowmen, and there were cannons, but their place was occupied by the knights; archers and cannon were alike rendered useless.

The day at last arrived. The English archers launched their arrows, but the French could give no reply. "The place was soft and ploughed up by the horses," says an eye-witness, Lefebvre de St. Remy, "so that the horse had great difficulty in moving from the spot where they stood. The French were so laden with harness that they could not advance; they were weighed down by long suits of steel, reaching to the knees and very heavy; they were pressed so closely together that they could not raise an arm to strike their enemies, unless it was those in the first rank." Finally 1200 men on the two wings detached themselves from the mass and advanced against the English, but they were attacked by a force of English archers hidden in a neighbouring wood, while others slipped and fell in the mud. Only 120 reached the enemy and they were vigorously repulsed. Their retreat spread disorder in the vanguard; the English archers pursued them, and armed with axes, swords, and maces fell upon men and horse, capturing those who could not fly. Little blood would have been shed if a report had not circulated that a new body of the French army had arrived and was pillaging the baggage of the English, whom they were about to attack from the rear. Henry gave orders that the prisoners should be killed and this massacre was only stopped when it was known that the alarm was false.

The English left 1600 men on the field of battle, the French 10,000, among whom were seven princes and 120 barons. Fifteen hundred prisoners, among whom were the Dukes of Orleans and Bourbon, the Counts of Eu, Vendôme, and Richemont, fell into

the hands of the victors. With this valuable booty, Henry embarked at Calais; his army, reduced to 10,000 men, could attempt no further enterprise, but this wonderful victory was enough.

Massacre of the Armagnacs at Paris (1418).—The Duke of Burgundy had taken no part in the Battle of Agincourt; his enemies, the Armagnacs, had sustained this shameful defeat. Had he hastened, he might have made himself master of Paris. The Count of Armagnac, who had become constable, showed greater promptitude; he took possession of the capital, of the king, of the new dauphin who was still a child, in a word, of the whole government. To regain some popularity for his party, he showed a praiseworthy activity. He borrowed ships from the Genoese, raised men in France, and laid siege to Harfleur (1416). But money ran short; he had recourse to the great expedient of the period, and debased the coinage. John the Fearless forthwith posed as the patron of the poor.

Paris murmured. John the Fearless, to increase the discontent, prevented the passage of foodstuffs to the city. He next carried off Queen Isabella from Tours and caused her to be declared regent of the kingdom; in her name he forbade the towns to pay the taxes imposed by Armagnac while at the same time he negotiated with England (1417).

The English had renewed their invasion. Henry V. had taken Caen (1417), and as a victor who had nothing to fear he had divided his army into four divisions in order to hasten his work. He had indeed no cause for fear. The Dukes of Brittany, Anjou, and Burgundy had signed treaties of neutrality with him; Armagnac could not prevent this, since he had been reduced to borrow from the saints, causing their shrines to be melted down. His supporters abandoned him because they were insufficiently paid, and he was forced to hand over the guardianship of Paris to the burghers, whom he hated and by whom he was betrayed.

Perrinet Leclerc, a smith of Petit-pont, had the guard of the postern gate of St. Germain. His son and some young companions of middle estate and light mind (according to Monstrelet, who had been punished on occasion for their misconduct) plotted to hand over the city to the Burgundians. On the night of May 29, 1418, Perrinet entered his father's chamber while he slept and carried away the keys which were under his pillow. The Sieur de l'Isle Adam, warned beforehand, was waiting on the other side of the ditch. He entered the town with 800 men; the former supporters of the Burgundian faction, the butchers,

the slaughterers, and all the market people, hastened to join him. Some Armagnacs managed to escape, carrying with them the dauphin; the majority, among them the constable, were taken and thrown into prison. Their lives were soon in peril. That popular violence, which had first appeared in 1413, now reappeared, exasperated, furious from misery and anxiety. Foodstuffs of every kind were wanting in Paris, and the city was threatened with famine. Soon the most sinister news spread amongst the mob. The Armagnacs were about to attack this gate, that suburb; the English were threatening another. The cause of all these ills, so it was declared on all sides, was the Armagnacs whom they held; vengeance must be taken on them that their plots might end.

On Sunday, June 12, 1418, the populace rose and rushed to the prisons, the Hôtel de Ville, the Temple, St. Eloi, St. Magloire, St. Martin, the great and little Chatelet, to murder indifferently all whom they found, Armagnacs or not. By Monday morning 1600 persons had perished. They were slaughtered in the prisons and in the streets; the corpses lay where they were, and wretched children played at dragging them about. On the dead body of the constable they amused themselves by placing a large band of wool to indicate the white scarf of the Armagnacs.

These terrible scenes had taken place when John the Fearless and the queen returned to Paris, welcomed by the enthusiastic plaudits of the mob, who believed that under John they would receive peace and plenty. Their hope was vain. Neither the one nor the other depended on the Duke of Burgundy; on the contrary, to all the existing evils there was added an epidemic which carried off 50,000 persons in Paris and the neighbourhood. The populace again became frenzied and fell upon the wretches whom they had overlooked before or who had languished in prison since June. On August 21, a vast crowd gathered under the orders of the executioner Capeluche and moved upon the prison. The Duke of Burgundy hastened to it, prayed, and went so far as to grasp the hand of Capeluche. He made no impression; a new massacre occurred. Some days later John the Fearless sent this ferocious horde to besiege the Armagnacs who were, so he said, shut up in Montlhéry; as soon as they had gone out of the city, he caused the gates of Paris to be closed and Capeluche to be beheaded.

Capture of Rouen by the English (1417).—John the Fearless remained master of the capital and the government, but he was weighed down by the crushing load of responsibility which this

position laid upon him. He was called upon to end the famine and calm a maddened populace; to oppose the Armagnac party who had the dauphin in their power and who held all the district round Paris; to make headway against the English who were methodically conquering the kingdom. Having taken possession of all lower Normandy, of Falaise, Vire, St. Lo, Courance, and Evreux, the invaders were besieging Rouen. The town held out for seven months. Horses, dogs, and rats were eaten; 12,000 old men, women, and children were driven beyond the walls to die of famine between the city and the English camp; all the resources of the defence were exhausted and the government did nothing. The Duke of Burgundy received the *oriflamme* (ancient standard of France) from the king and advanced as far as Pontoise and Beauvais, but dared not go farther. The heroic city surrendered. Henry exacted the vast fine of 300,000 crowns and the death of three burghers, including Alan Blanchard, the chief of the bowmen and the bravest defender of the place (1419). Two ransomed themselves, but Alan was executed. Edward III. had been less ferocious.

On hearing of the fall of Rouen all the towns and places of the province opened their gates. Henry showed himself lenient and gave good terms to all who took the oath of fealty. One woman refused to do so. "The young Dame de la Roche Guyon, whose husband had been killed at Agincourt," says Juvenal des Ursins, "preferred to be deprived of all her possessions rather than do homage to a foreign king and so place herself under the yoke of the ancient foes of the kingdom."

The madness of the English reached its height owing to the conquest of this rich province. To offers of peace, addressed to him by the Duke of Burgundy, Henry answered by extravagant demands—a daughter of Charles VI. in marriage and with her Guienne, Normandy, Brittany, Maine, Anjou, and Touraine. As the duke hesitated, Henry said to him roughly, "Good cousin, know that we will have your king's daughter and the rest of our demands or that we will drive you and all of them together out of the realm."

Murder of John the Fearless (1419).—Repulsed on this side, John the Fearless turned to the Armagnacs and had an interview with the dauphin at Pouilly (July 11, 1419). But his doubts and hatred revived and he turned once more to the English. Then the determined men who surrounded the young dauphin, afterwards Charles VII., resolved to make an end after their fashion of the prince who wished to hand over the kingdom to

foreigners. On September 10, 1419, the Duke of Burgundy, invited to an interview with the dauphin at the bridge of Montereau, was stabbed by Tanneguy Duchâtel and the prince's servants.

Treaty of Troyes (1420).—The English benefited by the results of a crime which they had not committed. The crime of Montereau gave them that which Crecy, Poitiers, and Agincourt had failed to give them; it gave the crown of France to a King of England. On May 21, 1420, the shameful Treaty of Troyes was concluded between Henry V., the Duke of Burgundy, and Queen Isabella of France, by which the last-named disinherited her son to crown her daughter. The very summary of the terms may well cause shame to any Frenchman. "It is granted that after our death the crown and realm of France shall remain and shall be perpetually with our said son Henry and his heirs. The power of governing the kingdom shall remain during our lifetime with our said son, King Henry, who shall rule by the advice of the nobles and wise men of the said kingdom. All conquests which the said King Henry shall make from the rebels shall be regarded as made for us. Considering the horrible and dreadful crimes which have been committed in the said kingdom by Charles, so-called Dauphin of Viennois, it is agreed that we, our son the said king, and our very dear Philip, Duke of Burgundy, will conclude no peace or agreement with the said Charles save with the common assent of all and each of us three and of the three estates of the two said kingdoms."

Death of Henry V. of England and of Charles VI. (1422).—But the country did not agree to the Treaty of Troyes. The long and vigorous resistance offered to the English at Sens, Montereau, Melun, and Meaux, and the defeat and death at Baugé in Anjou of the Duke of Clarence, brother of Henry V. (March 23, 1421), showed the English king that all France was far from being on his side. He foresaw the difficulty of the situation and the character of so laborious a conquest after his death. When, already ill, he was informed, during the siege of Meaux, that his young wife had given birth to a son at Windsor Castle, it is said that he exclaimed sadly, "Henry of Monmouth will have reigned little and conquered much; Henry of Windsor will reign long and lose all. The will of God be done."

Both parts of this prediction were accomplished, and the fulfilment of the first part was not long delayed. Still young, Henry V. died on August 31, 1422. Seven weeks later, on October 21, Charles VI. died also, mourned and regretted by the

sympathetic people to whom his reign had proved so disastrous, but who had seen their king suffer with them. "All the people in the streets and at the windows wept and cried as if each had seen his best-loved die: 'Ah, most dear prince, never shall we have so good a king. Never shall we see you more. Cursed be death. We shall have nothing but war now that you have left us. Rest in peace while we remain in tribulation and grief.'"

Council of Constance.—Important events occurred in the Church during this reign. Neither a mad king nor princes absorbed in their mutual rivalry gave peace to Christendom. Two councils, the first under the house of Valois, were held in Paris to find means for ending the schism. France demanded and secured the summons of a general council which met at Constance in 1414 and lasted until 1418. The Popes John XXIII. and Benedict XIII. were deposed and Martin V. elected, while, to prevent a new schism, it was proclaimed that general councils were superior to the pope. At the same time the council showed its hatred for heresy by condemning John Hus and Jerome of Prague, who were burned alive. John Gerson, chancellor of the University of Paris and possibly the author of the famous *Imitation of Christ*, another Frenchman, the Cardinal-Bishop of Cambrai, and Peter d'Ailly, the *Hammer of the Heretics*, were the lights of the council.

CHAPTER XXXII

CHARLES VII.: TO HIS RE-ENTRY INTO PARIS (1422–1436)

Henry VI. and Charles VII.—On November 10, 1422, the corpse of Charles VI. was laid with little pomp in the crypt of St. Denis and the French king-at-arms cried over the royal tomb, "God behold with mercy the soul of the most high and excellent prince, Charles, King of France, the sixth of that name, our natural and sovereign lord." Then he added, "God give long life to Henry, by the grace of God King of France and of England, our sovereign lord." About the same time, at Méhun-sur-Yèvre, in Berry, some French knights raised the royal banner, crying, "Long live King Charles, the seventh of that name, by the grace of God King of France."

The king proclaimed at St. Denis was a child of nine months, grandson of Charles VI. on his mother's side, and the government was carried on in his name by two of his uncles, by the Duke of

Bedford in France and by the Duke of Gloucester in England. This child was recognised as sovereign of the kingdom of France by the university, by the first prince of the blood, Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy, by Queen Isabella of Bavaria. Paris, the Ile de France, Picardy, Artois, Flanders, Champagne, and Normandy, almost all France north of the Loire, and Guienne, south of that river, obeyed him.

The king proclaimed in Berry was the only surviving son of Charles VI., a young man of nineteen, of gracious appearance but weak in body, pale, of little courage, and constantly in fear of a violent death. For the rest, adds Chastelain, he was a good Latinist, a good talker, and very wise in council. The last quality appeared later; for the moment and for many long years he showed zeal only for pleasure and displayed lassitude in the face of perils and in dealing with affairs of state. His authority was only recognised in Touraine, the Orléanais, Berry, Bourbonnais, Auvergne, Languedoc, Dauphiné, and Lyonnais.

Inertia of the King of Bourges: Moral Power of the King of France.—Two successive defeats, at Cravant in 1423 and at Verneuil in 1424, inaugurated the reign of Charles VII. and sufficed to destroy all his hopes in northern France. He seemed to be indifferent to this fact; his enemies nicknamed him in contempt the King of Bourges and he submitted to that position. He had removed his council, parliament, and university to Poitiers, but even the towns of Bourges and Poitiers were too large for him. He held his little court from castle to castle, giving all power to the Sieur de Giac, le Camus de Beaulieu, and the Sieur de la Tremoille; submitting willingly to the all-powerful influence of his mother-in-law, Yolande of Sicily. Yet even in this precarious situation he was a source of danger to the English.

Despite his weakness, the King of Bourges had an advantage. He was a French prince, whereas his rival was a foreigner. A pamphlet by Alan Chartier showed France urging her three children, the clergy, the knights, and the people, to forget their discords and unite to save her, to save themselves. Many began to agree with the young poet. The more that was seen of the English the more the severity of their rule and the shame of that disgraceful agreement which had delivered France over to them was felt. A French prince, the Duke of Alençon, taken prisoner at Verneuil, refused to buy his liberty by subscribing to the Treaty of Troyes. The marriage of Charles VII. with Marie of

Anjou attached that powerful family to his cause and through it the brave house of Lorraine, the courageous princes of which, always French at heart, had fallen at Crecy, Nicopolis, Agincourt, everywhere where France had fought. The Count of Foix, Governor of Languedoc, after having closely questioned the lawyers and after having carefully considered the probable turn of future events, declared that his conscience forced him to recognise Charles VII. as lawful king. The constable's sword was given to Arthur de Richmont, which reconciled the Duke of Brittany, John VI., with France and secured for the prince that supply of brave soldiers and capable leaders which that warlike province was long to furnish. Castille supplied ships with which the Norman Braquemont defeated an English fleet in 1419; these same vessels brought from Scotland five or six thousand soldiers who defeated their hereditary foes at Baugé.

Thus, even in the hands of the indolent Charles VII. the monarchy revived and attracted to itself all the French spirit in the country and all that was hostile to England abroad. The prince, by removing from his council, at the request of Richmont, Tanneguy Duchâtel and the Armagnacs who had been compromised in the affair of Montereau, prepared the way for a reconciliation with those whom the death of John the Fearless had thrown into the arms of the English.

Growing Disagreement between the English and the Duke of Burgundy.—The situation of the English was complicated by unforeseen difficulties. The alliance with Burgundy had given them Paris and the Treaty of Troyes; it was of paramount necessity that the duke should be conciliated. Bedford, regent in France, understood this fact and made it the keynote of his policy. But Gloucester, regent in England, refused to follow his brother's lead. He married Jacqueline, Countess of Hainault, Holland, Zeeland, and Friesland, who was already the wife of the Duke of Brabant, and this union led to a private war between Gloucester, who had contracted the marriage for the sake of a rich inheritance, and the Duke of Burgundy, who, being already master of Flanders, realised that this same inheritance was too near his own dominions to allow it to fall into the possession of an English duke.

Siege of Montargis (1427).—Some years passed without either party delivering any grave blows. In 1427 the English, in order to reach the Loire, laid siege with 3000 men to Montargis on the Loing. The town had only a small garrison under the brave

La Faille, but the soldiers were well seconded by the inhabitants. They defended themselves for three months, at the end of which time they informed the king that they had neither provisions nor munitions. Dunois and La Hire set out with 1600 men to attempt the forcing of an entry into the place. On the way La Hire met a priest and sought absolution from him. "Confess first," said the priest. "I have no time, for I must fall upon the English; but I have done all that a man of war is wont to do." The chaplain gave him absolution such as it was. La Hire, content, fell on his knees by the roadside and uttered this prayer, "God, I pray thee that to-day thou wilt do for La Hire that which thou wouldst have La Hire do for thee, if he were God and thou wert La Hire." There was not much ritual in this, but the knight was pressed for time. Having satisfied his conscience, as he felt, he fell bravely on the English, who were forced to raise the siege.

Siege of Orleans (1428–1429): Battle of the Herrings (1429).—A year later, Bedford resolved to press forward military operations with vigour. In June the Earl of Salisbury landed at Calais with 6000 men, the best available English troops, and was joined by Bedford with 4000 soldiers drawn from the garrisons of Normandy. This army took Jargeau, Janville, Meung-sur-Loire, Thoury, Beaugency, Marchemois, La Ferté Hubert, and gradually approached Orleans.

Orleans is the gate of Berry, Bourbonnais, and Poitou. If it were taken, the King of Bourges would become the King of Languedoc and Dauphiné. On October 12, 1428, the English appeared before the walls and began to construct siege works round the town, the command of which was entrusted to the bravest leaders of their army, such as William de la Pole, Earl of Suffolk; Talbot, the English Achilles; and William Glasdale, who vowed that he would kill all the population of Orleans. Salisbury was commander-in-chief.

The people of Orleans, having expected this siege, fortified the main part of the town, burning the suburbs. Their commander was the Sieur de Gaucourt, whom the English had held captive for thirteen years because he had obstinately defended Harfleur against them, when the inhabitants had opened the gates. The garrison was only 500 men at most, but they were all veterans. The burghers further rendered valuable aid. They formed thirty-four companies and each was charged with the defence of one of the thirty-four towers on the walls.

Artillery had now begun to play a great part in battles and

sieges. The besiegers were ill-equipped in this respect, and the burghers were delighted at the inaccuracy of the English gunners, who hurled eighty-pound cannon balls into the place and killed no one. The artillery of Orleans was very different. The town had seventy pieces of ordnance and twelve master gunners who directed the fire. Each cannon had its name and its special duty. The good cannon Riflard killed its man at each shot. Master John and his culverin also did tremendous execution. The gun was fixed on a light carriage and the English found it playing everywhere, killing their leaders, the Lord Grey one day, the marshal of the camp another. The English gunners directed all their efforts against this piece, and John fell. He was clearly dead; he was carried away on a bier, and the English rejoiced. An instant later, John and his culverin reappeared with even better effect. A schoolboy, during the dinner hour, found on the ramparts a cannon already loaded; he fired it and fled from fear. The ball struck the Earl of Salisbury full in the face as he had mounted one of the siege towers and as William Glasdale was saying to him, "My lord, you see your city." The English leader died, and the next day the bastard of Orleans, the handsome and brave Dunois, of whom the fair Valentine had said, "He has disarmed me," entered the place with the best knights of the time, La Hire, Xaintrailles, Marshal Boussac, and six or seven hundred soldiers. Others followed, and by degrees the garrison was raised to 7000 men.

But the shrewd blows and jests of the Orleanists did not disturb English perseverance. Each week the besiegers added a new tower to the ring of works which they had made, aiming at encircling the whole place and reducing it by famine. Four months had already passed and food was much reduced in the town; the work of revictualling became urgent, while it was also necessary to prevent the arrival of supplies for the English, who were known to be suffering from shortness of provisions. The Duke of Bedford despatched from Paris, under the command of Sir John Falstaff, 300 waggons of munitions, of food, and especially of herrings, guarded by 2500 soldiers. The Count of Clermont, eldest son of the Duke of Bourbon, undertook to intercept this convoy. He gathered a force of 5000 men, in which figured the flower of the nobility, all the chivalry of Auvergne, Bourbonnais, and Berry, and lay in wait for the English convoy. He met it near Rouvray (February 12, 1429).

At the approach of the French, Falstaff made a barricade of

the waggons which he was convoying, placed his archers on them, and blocked the gaps between the waggons with barbed sticks. The French halted, their cavalry remained mounted in position, while their artillery, covered by their archers and infantry, opened fire on the English barricade. Soon a number of waggons were overturned or broken in pieces along with the archers who garrisoned them, and large breaches exposed the interior of the barricade to view. If the battle had gone on in this way, the little English army would have been lost, but the knights did not wish to leave all the honour to the artillery. They dismounted, despite their heavy armour, and without orders advanced upon the English. Forthwith the archers regained the advantage and forced the French to retire. The field of battle was strewn with herrings which fell out of the cases broken by the bullets. The people of Orleans consoled themselves for their misfortune by a jest, calling the encounter the Battle of the Herrings.

But the situation of the town grew daily more grave, and Charles VII. did not rouse himself from his indolence. The nobles had illustrated at Rouvray once and for all the degree of skill which they had in battle. The Count of Clermont, who was responsible for the defeat, shamefully left the town with the 2000 men whom he commanded. The Admiral of France, the Chancellor of France, the Archbishop of Reims, and the Bishop of Orleans had anticipated this conduct, despite the prayers of the citizens who tried to hold them back. The besieged began to despair. They humbly represented to the Duke of Bedford that their town was in the appanage of the Duke of Orleans, who had been a captive in England since Agincourt and who had adhered to the Treaty of Troyes, so that there was no ground for despoiling him. The English made no answer to this appeal to their generosity, and the citizens turned to the Duke of Burgundy, begging him to take their town and to protect it. Philip the Good willingly agreed to this, and entered into negotiations with the Duke of Bedford. He replied coldly that he was not inclined to act as beater for another to collect the game.

Revival of National Sentiment.—That which the nobles could not do, the lower class accomplished. The humiliation of France and of her king began to weigh on the minds of the people. Up to that time, a man had been a citizen of his town and no more; in face of English attacks, they felt that all were Frenchmen. No one, a century earlier, had been disturbed about the siege of Calais by Edward III.: all France was interested in the fate

of Orleans. Angers, Tours, and Bourges sent provisions; Poitiers and La Rochelle sent money, the Bourbonnais, Auvergne, and Languedoc sent saltpetre, sulphur, and steel.

This sentiment had been unknown in the Middle Ages, and was destined to play a great part in modern society; patriotism was born at this time. In the journal of a Paris burgher, about 1418–1421, the following passage occurs: "Throughout Paris sad lamentations might be heard, little children crying, 'I am dying of hunger.' Crowded round a stove, thirty children, boys and girls, might be found perishing of hunger and cold. They died so rapidly that it was necessary to dig great pits in the cemeteries, in which they threw them by thirties and forties at a time, sprinkling a little earth over them and packing them like bacon. The gravediggers declared that they interred more than 100,000 persons. The cobblers, on the day of their guild meeting, estimated the deaths in their fraternity, and found that they were over 1800, both masters and men, in these two months. Bands of wolves scoured the countryside, and at night even entered the city to carry off the corpses. Labourers left their fields, saying, 'Let us fly to the woods with the wild beasts. Adieu, wives and children. Let us be as evil as we can. Let us give ourselves up to the Devil.'"

If such was the state of affairs in Paris and its neighbourhood, it may be imagined what occurred in the rural districts. These miseries were due to a variety of causes, but the people knew of one cause only. All the sufferings which they endured were attributed to the English; all the hatred which they felt was directed against the English; to drive out the English was the one thought which constantly filled their minds, and as human aid failed them they counted upon God. This hope gradually spread throughout France, and the belief grew that the kingdom, betrayed by a woman, the unworthy Queen Isabella of Bavaria, would be delivered by a maid of the people, a virgin. This heroic daughter of the masses, this virgin deliverer, was Joan of Arc.

Joan of Arc (1429–1431).—Joan of Arc, the third daughter of a peasant, Jacques d'Arc, and of Isabella Rommée, was born in 1409 at the village of Domrémy, between Champagne and Lorraine. Life on this frontier was very disturbed. War was continual; sometimes the English, sometimes the Burgundians, sometimes the grand companies, spread over the land, and it was necessary to be ever ready to fight, to fly into the neighbouring forest if it was impossible to resist, returning when the enemy

had passed by to make good his ravages. The men of Domrémy were Armagnacs; two leagues from their village was Marey, the people of which were equally determined Burgundians, and the men and children of the two villages never met without fighting. Joan had often seen her three brothers return covered with blood.

War, battles, wounds, devastation, formed the first picture which greeted the eyes of Joan. At the fireside, when she stayed to knit and spin with her mother, it was still tales of war that she heard, drawn from the holy traditions, stories of St. Michael, the archangel of battles, of St. Catherine and St. Margaret, to whom the young peasant offered devoutly the crowns and garlands she had woven. She regarded them as her patron saints, dreamed of them in the oak-wood under the great beech tree of the fairies, a little way from her dwelling. In all her dreams she saw also the figure of Charles VII., that poor young king denied by his mother and expelled from his inheritance by the English.

Joan grew up, reached the age of fourteen, in the midst of all these troubles, with a strong body but an anxious mind. She was a good girl, "simple, sweet, and timid," say her contemporaries, devoted to the Church and holy places, confessing often and increasing by scourgings that exaltation of mind, that second-sight which looked beyond her surroundings and made her receive with sincere faith the visions that came to her. One day, in 1423, in the summer and on a fast day, the young girl was in the garden near the church at midday when she suddenly saw a great light, and from the midst of this light heard a voice saying, "Joan, good and wise child, go often to church." On another occasion she saw in this light beautiful figures, one of whom, who was winged, said to her, "Joan, go and deliver the King of France and restore the kingdom to him." She trembled greatly and answered, "Sir, I am but a poor maid; I know not how to lead men-at-arms." The voice replied, "St. Catherine and St. Margaret will assist you." She saw again the archangel and the two saints and heard the voices; she heard them for four years, then it was time to obey them.

But it was difficult to see how they could be obeyed. In answer to some timid suggestions, her father declared that rather than see her go away with soldiers he would kill her with his own hands. She obtained leave to be sent to Vaucouleurs to one of her uncles, André Laxart, on the ground that she would tend her aunt who was ill. Her uncle at once supported Joan's mission, and persuaded her to seek the help of the Sieur

de Baudricourt, captain of the place. Baudricourt received the messenger rudely and answered that it would be well to suppress this girl and send her back to her father. Joan was not repulsed, "For," she said, "ere mid-Lent I must be with the king, and I will be though I wear my legs to the knees." She went to the captain and succeeded. Baudricourt was not convinced, but he was forced by the people, who were filled with admiration. They combined to provide for Joan, to buy her a horse, as the captain would give her nothing but a sword. She cut her long hair, put on a man's dress, and despite the last opposition of her parents, left Vaucouleurs, under the guard of six men-at-arms, at the beginning of February, 1429.

Her journey from the banks of the Meuse to those of the Loire was terrible at such a time. Joan might have distrusted the rough guardians who had been assigned to her and have feared the brigands and the enemy. Nothing terrified her, however; she even reassured her companions, saying, "Fear nothing; God has ordained my journey, and for it was I born; my brothers in paradise tell me that I shall accomplish it." Her enthusiasm and that which she inspired in others enabled her to triumph over all difficulties and all dangers. On February 24 she reached Chinon, where Charles VII. then was. The council discussed whether the king should see her; after two days it was resolved, as things went ill at Orleans, to try any means to save that important town.

Joan was received in the midst of pomp and display which did not disconcert her. Without either timidity or boldness, she at once recognised the king, whose image had for so many years filled her thoughts. She went straight to him, though he tried to hide among the courtiers, and said, "Gentle dauphin, why do you not believe me? I tell you that God has pity on you, your kingdom, and your people, for St. Louis and St. Charlemagne are on their knees before Him praying for you. If you will lend me men I will raise the siege of Orleans and I will lead you to be consecrated at Reims, for it is the will of God that his enemies, the English, shall go back to their land and that the kingdom shall remain to you."

The sceptical court of Charles VII. was not easily convinced of the reality of a miraculous mission. It was necessary to make sure that the newcomer was not an emissary of the devil. Bishops, monks, doctors, and professors of the University of Poitiers solemnly cross-examined her. Joan was asked why, if God wished to deliver the people of France, he had need of men-at-

arms. She answered without concern, "The men-at-arms fight, but it is God that giveth the victory." Another asked if she believed in God, and added that God would not wish her words to be believed until at least she had given them some sign. "I am not come to work signs and miracles," she answered, "my sign shall be that I will raise the siege of Orleans. Only give me men-at-arms, few or many, and I will go."

It was neither the court nor the judges whom it was necessary to convince, but the people; and the people were convinced. Public opinion forced the hand of the government; Joan of Arc was equipped, armed, and sent, or as she said *called*, to Orleans.

Relief of Orleans (May 8, 1429).—Orleans was in great danger, but it must be added that the English besiegers were also in a perilous situation. The fatigues of a long winter siege, the losses sustained in battle and desertion, had greatly weakened their army; the Duke of Burgundy, wounded by the conduct of the Duke of Bedford towards him, had recalled his troops, and the English army was reduced to four or five thousand men, dispersed in a dozen siege towers which were not connected with each other.

Discipline and union in the attacking forces were alone needed to reduce so feeble an enemy. For the time being there was nothing more disorderly than the bands of adventurers who had thrown themselves into the town to defend it and who saw in war only profit and pleasure. The prayer of La Hire has already been mentioned; on another occasion he said, "If God the Father became a soldier, he would also without a doubt become a robber." To make *morale* and to discipline these rude and savage natures was in itself an enterprise beyond the power of royal authority at this time, and Charles VII. only attempted it with danger to himself ten years later. But what the monarchy could not do, general enthusiasm performed. On a sign from Joan of Arc, they renounced their orgies, went to confession, and took the communion. La Hire ceased to swear by his baton. The army, transformed, became invincible.

On April 29, 1429, Joan entered Orleans with a convoy of provisions and a weak escort; on May 4 she brought in an army, which was halted at Blois, passing and repassing the besiegers' lines without moving the English. Beside the fact that they were actually weak, the English believed that all the powers of hell were leagued against them. Joan, who was a saint within the walls of Orleans, was a sorceress in the English

lines; the besiegers heaped gross insults on her, calling her a cowherd, a wanton, and other names, and yet fearing her power. As a sorceress, they thought she could perform miracles, and in their opinion only by a miracle could they have been filled with such abject terror. The famed English soldiers themselves evacuated their works south of the Loire, with the exception of two, in which they concentrated all their forces, those of the Augustines and the Tournelles.

These two fortresses intercepted communications between the town and Berry and it was resolved to attack them. On May 6 Joan crossed the Loire, advanced against the tower of the Augustines, rallied her men who were about to fly in a panic of terror, planted her standard, bearing the fleur-de-lys, on the ditch, and the work was taken, burned, and destroyed. Next day, May 7, the whole army and people attacked Tournelles. Joan was the first to place a ladder against the rampart; she mounted it and was severely wounded, but this merely animated her soldiers. Assailed on all sides, the English tried in vain to escape; the famous captain, William Glasdale, fell armed into the river and was drowned; 500 of his men perished. Tournelles was taken, and not an Englishman remained south of the Loire. Next day, May 8, Suffolk and Talbot evacuated the northern works, abandoning munitions, artillery, baggage, and wounded prisoners. Orleans still celebrates the day of its deliverance.

The soldiers and the whole population of Orleans wished to pursue the English, but Joan forbade it. "Let them go," she said, "do not pursue them or kill them; to-day is the Sabbath."

On May 13 she left Orleans to seek the king at Tours. As soon as she saw him, she curtsied gracefully and embracing him by the knees said, "Gentle dauphin, do not hold so many long councils, but come to receive the crown at Reims. I am eager that you should go there and I doubt not that there you will receive your worthy consecration."

Battle of Patay (1429): Charles VII. crowned at Reims.—If Charles VII. could be crowned at Reims he would gain a decisive victory over his young rival, Henry VI., and become truly King of France. In view of the depression with which the English were filled, the expedition was certainly less dangerous than it appeared. But the politicians again believed that they were wiser than Joan and insisted that it was essential the English should first be driven from the banks of the Loire. Jargeau, Beaugeny, and Meung-sur-Loire were taken and a battle was fought four or five miles from Patay. The English were sur-

prised; they showed neither the coolness nor the prudence which they usually displayed and 2500 men were killed. Falstaff fled; the invincible Talbot and Lord Scales were taken prisoners.

After this further victory the advice of Joan was necessarily taken. The people believed in her alone; even the nobles rallied round her. It was said that as the king could give only three francs to each man for the whole campaign, "Those gentlemen who were unable to mount and arm themselves went as archers and swordsmen mounted on horses."

The French left Gien on June 28, 1429. The army was joyfully received by the peasants in the hamlets and villages. The towns hesitated. Auxerre, which belonged to the Duke of Burgundy, would not open its gates, but supplied provisions and promised to recognise Charles as soon as Troyes, Châlons, and Reims had submitted.

Troyes was strongly garrisoned by Burgundians and English, and as the walls were in good state it declined to admit the royal army. There was nothing for it but to undertake a siege, although the whole artillery force consisted of a single bomb thrower and the army was short of food, the soldiers having subsisted for five or six days on roots which they gathered in the fields. The assembled council anxiously debated; Joan assured them that they would be in the town in three days. "We could well wait six," they answered, "if we could be sure that your words would come true." "Six?" she cried. "Well, you shall enter the town to-day." She ran to the ramparts, her standard in hand; she caused the ditch to be filled and began to attack the wall. The English, alarmed by the fate of Orleans, themselves offered to evacuate the town.

Charles only passed by Troyes, and was not delayed at Châlons which readily opened its gates. On July 13 he arrived before Reims. Two Burgundian lords, the Sieur de Chatillon and the Sieur de Saveuse, were in command, but they had no soldiers. They assembled the burghers and asked them to hold out for six weeks, at the end of which time they declared that the Dukes of Burgundy and Bedford would arrive with an army so powerful that the siege would be easily raised. The burghers refused to run this risk, persuaded the two captains to retire, and sent a deputation to the Chancellor of France, who was also Archbishop of Reims, begging him to enter his episcopal seat. On July 17 Charles was at last crowned at Reims according to the ancient ceremonial.

Continuation of the War against the English.—Joan had

accomplished the two great deeds which her voices had bidden her perform; she had relieved Orleans and she had caused the king to be crowned. She sighed to return to her village. At her entry into Reims, says the chronicler, "When she saw the poor people of the land crying Noël and weeping for joy and gladness, and when they went before the king chanting the *Te Deum*, she said to the Chancellor of France and to Count Dunois, 'In the name of God, here is a good people and devout, and when I come to die, I would fain die in this land.' Then Count Dunois asked her, 'Joan, do you know when you will die and where?' She answered that she was in God's hand, and said to the other lord, 'I have done what the Lord commanded me, and now I greatly wish to return to my father and mother and to look after their flocks and herds.'" But her part was not yet played, for the English still held a considerable part of the kingdom. Joan, with the same resolution which had led to such success at Orleans and Reims, demanded an immediate advance against Paris. The king's advisers could not accustom themselves to such heroic measures—which are at times superior to prudent counsels; they resolved to take the small places which lay near Paris. These towns opened their gates of their own accord, and the royal army entered without opposition into Laon, Soissons, Coulommiers, Provins, Château-Thierry, Compiègne, Beauvais, Senlis, St. Denis. But when it arrived before Paris the chance was lost.

Paris was too large a town to be carried by a sudden attack, and the Parisians were too deeply involved in the recent revolutions to surrender to Charles VII. without absolute necessity. They had had time to recover from the astonishment created by the coronation at Reims and had prepared for defence. They offered a brave resistance. Joan conducted the attack with her accustomed courage; she crossed the trench around the city and was wounded by an arrow which pierced her leg. Nevertheless she incurred all the blame for this attempt and saw Charles VII. falling back into his old indolence, returning to Chinon, in order to be behind the barrier of the Loire, and leaving an order for the evacuation of St. Denis. She saw the Duke of Burgundy regain his courage, recover Soissons, and besiege Compiègne. Joan was touched by the fate of these poor burghers, who had given themselves up to Charles VII., and threw herself into the town to defend it.

Captivity and Death of Joan of Arc (1430–1431).—On the very day of her arrival, May 24, 1430, she made a *sortie*, but the

besiegers repulsed it and when she regained the gate she found it shut. Abandoned in the midst of her enemies, she was thrown from her horse by a Picard archer and taken by the bastard of Vendôme, who sold her to John of Luxemburg. John, in order to gain peacefully, and to the prejudice of his elder brother, the lordships of Ligny and St. Pol, needed the help of the Duke of Burgundy. The Duke of Burgundy, that he might not be disturbed while he appropriated Brabant, Brussels, and Louvain, despite the claims of his aunt Margaret, needed the help of the English. The English were inclined to allow anything, provided that Joan of Arc was handed over to them. They paid 10,000 francs for the person of the Maid of France.

To the French, Joan was the messenger of God; to the English she was the messenger of the devil. Peter Cauchon, Bishop of Beauvais, a violent man who was ready to do anything in order to secure the see of Reims, undertook to prove a charge of sorcery in proper legal form. He based the accusation on four points: that despite the laws of the Church Joan had practised magical arts; that she had taken arms despite the prohibition of her parents; that she wore clothes which were not those of her sex; and that she had professed to have received revelations not sanctioned by ecclesiastical authority. A poor girl of nineteen thus found herself opposed, without help, to judges sold to her enemies, who arbitrarily suppressed evidence of her innocence, forbade her to appeal to pope or council, tried to confuse her with absurd, captious, or infinitely delicate questions, and who yet found themselves nonplussed by her brave answers.

She was asked if she believed herself to be in a state of grace. She answered, "If I am not, may God bring me to it; if I am, may God keep me therein." "Did you not say that standards made by soldiers in imitation of yours would bring good luck?" "No; I said only, 'Attack the English boldly and I will enter the battle myself.'" She added that she had slain no one. Asked why her standard was carried into the church of Reims at the coronation before that of the captains, she replied that it had been through the heat of the day and deserved to be honoured. She was asked what was in the minds of the men who kissed her hands, feet, and clothes. She said that they came willingly to her because she had done them no harm, but had sustained and defended them with all her might. Did she believe that she might leave her father and mother without their consent? Ought she not to honour her father and mother?

She replied that they had forgiven her. Did she think that she had not sinned in acting as she had done? She answered that God commanded her; if she had had a hundred fathers and mothers, she would have done the same. Did she believe that her king had done right in killing, or in causing to be killed, the Duke of Burgundy? "It was a great injury to the realm of France, but the matter was their concern; God had sent her to save the King of France." Did St. Catherine and St. Margaret hate the English? She replied that they loved whom God loved and hated whom God hated. Did God hate the English? "I know nothing as to the love or hate that God has for the English, but I know well that they will soon be driven out of France, save those who die there."

The judges harped on the male garments that Joan had worn, contrary to the laws of the Church, which she still wore, and which she was unwilling to abandon. The villains pretended not to understand what the poor girl dared not say to them, that in the camp and in the prison itself, these clothes had been and were still her safeguard.

Her condemnation had been resolved beforehand, but it was well to win from her some remark which might injure Charles VII., and all means were employed for this purpose. Threats had little effect on that brave heart; recourse was had to promises, to the most dangerous of temptations for her, the offer that she should be taken from the hands of her English gaolers and handed over to the custody of the Church. She gave way, and without understanding its meaning signed the recantation which was presented to her; then by an exhibition of grace and moderation she was condemned only to imprisonment for life, to the bread and water of affliction, that she might lament her sins.

It was then that the English complained. Their fortunes went from bad to worse. An expedition against Dauphiné failed; Xaintrailles, Boussac, Vendôme, and Barbasan beat the Burgundians and their allies in Champagne and Picardy. The movement begun by Joan continued. As there were more blows to bear and less booty to receive, the English recruits were less anxious to cross the sea and the invaders were the more embittered against Joan. At Rouen, Lord Warwick said loudly, "The king paid dearly for her; he wished her to die by a judicial sentence and meant her to be burned; we shall know how to gain possession of her again." And they did regain possession of her. On Trinity Sunday, when she should have

been handed over, one of the English who guarded her took her woman's dress away and left her only male clothes. She told him that she was forbidden, as he knew, to wear them. They would give her no others, and she had to put them on. The judges were well prepared to witness the crime; they condemned her as relapsed, and sentenced her to be burned alive, the execution being fixed to take place at once.

On the morning, Cauchon sent a confessor, Brother Martin l'Advenu, to announce her fate and to bring her to repent. When he told the poor girl of the death which she was to die that day, she began to weep piteously and to tear her hair. "Alas, that I should be treated so horribly and cruelly, that my body, which I have ever kept pure, should be burned and reduced to ashes. I would rather be beheaded seven times than be burned once. I call upon God, the great judge of wrongs and of pitiless deeds." It was nine o'clock when she was again dressed in her woman's clothes and placed on a waggon. Until then the maid had never despaired. She said often that the English would kill her, but in her heart she had not believed it. She did not imagine that she could be abandoned to her fate; she believed in her king and in the good people of France. She said expressly, "In the prison or at the judgment there will be some difficulty by which I shall be delivered to great victory." But when the king and the people failed her, she had another resource, the powerful and certain help of her heavenly friends, her good and dear saints. At the siege of St. Pierre, when her men abandoned her, the saints sent an invisible army to her aid. They could not abandon their obedient daughter, to whom they had so often promised safety and deliverance.

Her thoughts may be imagined when she found that she was really to die, when mounted on her waggon she passed through the crowd, under the guard of 800 English armed with swords and lances. She wept and lamented, but accused neither the king nor her saints. Only one remark she made, "O Rouen, Rouen, am I then to die here?"

The end of her sad journey was the Vieux Marché, the fish market. Three scaffolds had been erected. On one was an episcopal and royal chair, the throne of the Cardinal of England, among the seats of his suffragans. On another sat the actors in the sad drama, the preacher, judges, and bailiff; and on the third was the prisoner. Near by was a great scaffold covered by layers of wood; its height was alarming. This was not merely intended to make the scene more impressive. It was designed

also in order that, owing to the height of the stake, the torch should be applied only to the bottom, that the duration of the execution might not be shortened or death hastened by the victim being set on fire at once. There was to be no opportunity for justice to be defeated by the burning of a dead body; Joan was to be really burned alive, while, placed at the top of this pile, she would be observed by all, ringed in as she was by armed soldiers. Slowly and gradually she was to be burned under the eyes of a curious crowd; it was easy to believe that she would display some weakness, that some word, which might be taken as a recantation, would escape her, perhaps some muttered prayer, some humble cry for pardon such as a lost girl might utter.

The terrible ceremony began with a sermon. Master Nicholas Midy, one of the lights of the University of Paris, preached on the edifying text, "When a member of the Church is ill, all the Church is ill." The poor Church could be cured only by the cutting off of the member. He ended with the formula, "Joan, depart in peace, the Church can no more defend you."

The Church's judge, the Bishop of Beauvais, then gently exhorted her to concern herself with her soul and to recall all her misdeeds, that she might be moved to penitence. His assessors had assured him that it was right for him to read again Joan's recantation; he did not do so. He feared an uproar, protests. But the poor girl would scarcely have so played with her life; she had other thoughts. Even before she had been exhorted to repent, she had fallen on her knees, invoking God, the Virgin, St. Catherine, and St. Michael, pardoning all and asking pardon, saying to those by her, "Pray for me." She especially asked the priests each to say a mass for her soul. So devout, humble, and touching was her attitude that emotion grew and no one could restrain himself; the Bishop of Beauvais began to weep, while the Bishop of Boulogne sobbed; even the English were moved to tears, the cardinal amongst them.

But the judges, though for a moment disconcerted, soon regained their composure, and the Bishop of Beauvais, wiping his eyes, began to read Joan's condemnation. He recalled to the mind of the victim all her crimes, schism, idolatry, invocation of demons, how she had been admitted to repentance and how, seduced by the prince of lies, she had relapsed, "Alas! as a dog returns to his vomit. Therefore we pronounce that you are a diseased member, and as such must be cut off from the

Church. We deliver you to the secular arm, praying it none the less to be lenient to you, avoiding death and the mutilation of members."

Abandoned by the Church, Joan placed all her trust in God. She asked for a cross, and an Englishman handed her a cross of wood made from a stick; this she kissed and placed under her clothes on her flesh. But she still wished for the cross of the Church that she might hold it before her eyes in death. The good bailiff Massieu and Brother Isambart brought one to her from the parish church of St. Sauveur. As she embraced it and Isambart encouraged her, the English began to feel that the ceremony had gone on long enough: it was now almost midday; the soldiers grumbled and the captains asked, "What, priests? Would you have us dine here?" Then, losing patience and not waiting for the orders of the bailiff who alone had authority to send her to her death, they caused two sergeants to mount the scaffold and to remove the priests. At the foot of the tribunal Joan was seized by men-at-arms who dragged her to the stake, saying to the executioner, "Do your duty." The brutality of the soldiers horrified many of those present, including even the judges, who fled that they might see no more.

When she found herself in the square and in the hands of the English, her nature was outraged and her flesh trembled. Again she cried, "O Rouen, you are then to be my last abode!" She said no more and did not offend with her lips, even in this moment of terror and anguish. She accused neither the king nor the saints. But when she reached the top of the pyre and saw the great city and the motionless, silent crowd beneath her, she could not refrain from saying, "Ah, Rouen, Rouen! I fear greatly that you will suffer for my death."

She was bound to the stake and crowned with a mitre bearing the words, "Heretic, relapsed, apostate, idolatress." The executioner lit the fire. She saw it from above and uttered a cry. Then, as the friar urged her to pay no attention to the flame, she forgot herself, and feared for him, causing him to go down.

Proof that she had made no express recantation is afforded by the conduct of Cauchon, who felt himself obliged to go to the foot of the pyre, almost to look his victim in the face, in order that he might extract some word from her. He secured only one despairing utterance. Joan said to him with the same softness that she had used throughout, "Bishop, by your means I die; had you put me in the prisons of the Church, this would not have

come to pass." There was doubtless hope that when she saw the king had abandoned her, she would at last accuse him and speak against him. She still excused him; "What I have done, well or ill, the king has had no share in it; not by him was I advised."

The flames mounted. When they touched her, the unhappy victim groaned and demanded holy water; water appeared to be the cry of fear. But recovering at once, she afterwards only uttered the name of God, the angels, and the saints, rendering testimony to them: "Yes, my voices were from God, my voices have not deceived me."

This great saying was attested by the necessary and sworn witness of her death, the Dominican who mounted the pyre with her, whom she made go down, but who talked to her from below, heard her and held the cross towards her. We have also another witness of this holy death; a witness of great weight, who was himself a true saint. This witness, whose name has been handed down in history, is the Augustinian monk, Brother Isambart de la Pierre.

Twenty years later, the two venerable brothers, simple monks, vowed to poverty and having nothing either to gain or to fear in this world, deposed that they heard her in the fire invoking her saints and her archangel. She repeated the Saviour's name, and finally, bowing her head, uttered one loud cry, "Jesus."

Ten thousand men wept. Some of the English laughed or tried to laugh. One of them, one of the most furious, had sworn that he would put a faggot on the fire. She died at the moment when he did so, and he was miserable. His comrades took him to a tavern to drink that he might regain his spirits. But he could not do so; "I saw," he said, despite himself, "I saw, as she breathed her last, a dove come from her mouth." Others saw in the flames the word she had last uttered, "Jesus." In the evening Brother Isambart was visited by the executioner; he was filled with terror and confessed; he could not believe that God had pardoned him. One of the English king's secretaries said aloud, as he turned away, "We are lost; we have burned a saint."

Reverses of the English: Coronation of Henry VI. at Paris (1431).—The "sorceress," the "she-devil," was burned; the charm would doubtless be broken, the witchcraft dispelled, and nothing would prevent the English from conquering the kingdom of France. But before they insisted on their new material superiority, they considered that it would be well to secure moral superiority and to regularise the title of Henry VI. by having

him crowned. The coronation, to which a "devil" had led Charles VII., was by the fact of her presence null and void, and the English wished to confer on their young king an orthodox and unimpeachable coronation. But it proved to be a disappointment. The ceremony took place (December 16, 1431), not at Reims, which the English did not hold, but at Paris. An English prelate officiated, the Cardinal of Winchester, to the great discontent of the Bishop of Paris; English peers were present, but not a single French prince; there was no freeing of prisoners, no reduction of taxation, no *largesse* to the people. "A burgher, marrying his children, does things better," said the city.

General discontent resulted from the ceremony which was designed to make Henry VI. popular, and the English were left to hope that they might recover their former good fortune in war.

They failed, however, to take Compiègne; it resisted for six months and was then relieved; Marshal Boussac almost took Rouen, his advance-guard being already in the castle when his soldiers quarrelled over the division of the spoils, which they had not yet secured, and all was lost (1432). Dunois had more success at Chartres. He had heard that a certain famous preacher would deliver a sermon in a given church on a certain day; all the garrison were devoutly present at the service, and during its progress the French took the town. The English, who lost this important point, were unable even to capture a hamlet. A certain French captain, John Foucault, posted himself at Ligny and disturbed the suburbs of Paris. Bedford and Warwick marched in full array to besiege this small place. They assembled much artillery, effected a breach, and then, through the open gap, saw the garrison waiting bravely for them. They retired to Paris, where they arrived on Easter Eve, "apparently for confession," says the Paris burgher sarcastically in his journal. Meanwhile, the soldiers of fortune in the service of France took St. Valery, Gerberoy, Denis, and other places.

Rupture of the Anglo-Burgundian Alliance.—The English, everywhere unfortunate, had all the more need of their Burgundian alliance, but Philip the Good had secured possession of some correspondence between the two brothers, Bedford and Gloucester. The latter suggested the arrest of the Duke of Burgundy, while the former contended that it would be better to put him to death and that the murder could be committed without danger, that he could be removed, for example, at Paris at a tournament to which he had been invited. In the meantime,

the dukes wrote to the people of Ghent urging them to revolt and offering them English support. The Duchess of Bedford, sister of Philip the Good, prevented an immediate rupture, but she died in November, 1432.

Every error which the English committed was skilfully exploited by the Breton Constable Richmont, who had then complete control of the affairs of the French court. His sane policy consisted in effecting a reconciliation between France and Burgundy, turning the Treaty of Troyes against the English. It appeared to be an easy matter for Philip the Good to change his attitude; grievances were not wanting, but a species of chivalrous loyalty to ungrateful friends impelled the Burgundian duke to decline to take part in any negotiations which had not the restoration of a general peace for their object. A real European congress was therefore summoned to meet at Arras in 1435.

Treaty of Arras (1435).—On the appointed day representatives of all the Christian states met at Arras; ambassadors of the pope, the emperor, the Kings of Castille, Navarre, Arragon, Portugal, Sicily, Naples, Cyprus, Poland, and Denmark, of the good cities of the realm and of the University. The Constable Richmont and eighteen great lords represented the King of France, while the Cardinal of Winchester and a number of lords represented the King of England. And the Duke of Burgundy was also present.

The conference opened on August 5, 1435, in the chapel of St. Wast, and the English at first demanded the execution pure and simple of the Treaty of Troyes. They then asked for the *status quo*, and as they were offered only Normandy and Aquitaine in full sovereignty, they left Arras on September 6. Every one then asked the Duke of Burgundy to make his peace with the King of France. He had his scruples; he had sworn to avenge the death of his father. The cardinal legates who presided at the assembly volunteered to release him at once from so evil an oath. The duke had signed the Treaty of Troyes. The lawyers affirmed that the treaty was void, since Roman law prohibited dealing with the succession of a living man. In the midst of the discussions Bedford died. Philip forthwith believed himself to be free from all ties, and signed (September 21, 1435) the Treaty of Arras. It was agreed "that the king should declare, or that one of his chief men should be empowered to declare, to the Duke of Burgundy that the death of the duke's father, John, whom God absolve, was wholly and entirely accomplished by the actual

doers of the deed and by evil counsel; that the king had always deplored the event and did deplore it with all his heart; that if he had been of age and of such understanding as he now was, he would have prevented it with all his might, but that he was very young, he had little knowledge, and he was not made aware that he had the power. And the king prayed the duke that he would put out of his heart all hatred and rancour which he felt on account of that event and that peace and love should exist between them."

"For the soul of the said Lord John, Duke of Burgundy, foundations and buildings should be established; in the church of Montereau, in which the corpse of the said duke was first interred, a chapel should be built, and a perpetual chaplain appointed to say a requiem mass each day for ever; the chapel should be endowed suitably with 60 livres a year. In the same town of Montereau, or as near it as should seem well, there should be built and completed by the king at his own expense a church, convent, and monastery which were to be endowed with good revenues, sufficient to bring in the sum of 800 livres a year. On the bridge of Montereau, where the evil deed was done, there should be erected and maintained for ever at the king's expense a fair cross, such as the Cardinal of St. Croix and his commissary should decide. In the church of Chartreux-les-Dijon, where the body of Duke John was interred, the king should found and pay for a high mass to be said daily in perpetuity, endowed with a revenue of 100 livres a year sufficiently secured."

More material satisfaction was also accorded to the duke. He was ceded the counties of Auxerre and Macon in perpetuity, the castles of Peronne, Roye, and Montdidier, and under power of redemption the Somme towns St. Quentin, Corbie, Amiens, Abbeville, and St. Valery. He received the reversion of Artois, exemption during their joint lives of homage to the king and from all other duties, so that he became really an independent sovereign in his own demesnes.

Charles VII. at Paris (1436).—These concessions were hard and humiliating, but they at once brought their compensation, as the Treaty of Arras gave Paris to the King of France. The burghers invited Richmont and opened the gate St. Jacques to him (May 29, 1436). Lord Willoughby and the fifteen hundred Englishmen who garrisoned Paris shut themselves up in the Bastille. Richmont was anxious to take them, as he estimated the ransom of these lords to be worth at least 200,000 livres, but he

had received no supplies from the king for his expedition and was without any siege requisites. The English offered to surrender the Bastille on condition that they should be allowed to retire with their goods and that such as wished might be allowed to follow them. This capitulation was accepted; the English marched out by the St. Antoine gate, went round the walls amid the hoots of the people, and embarked on the Seine for Rouen.

EIGHTH PERIOD—FINAL VICTORY OF THE MONARCHY OVER THE FEUDAL ARISTOCRACY

(1436-1491)

CHAPTER XXXIII

EXPULSION OF THE ENGLISH FROM FRANCE AND THE GOVERNMENT OF CHARLES VII. (1436–1461)

Situation of the Kingdom.—Some time after the surrender of Paris, Charles VII. visited the capital. Pestilence still raged there; 5000 people had died in the hospitals, 45,000 in the city, and half of these of hunger rather than of disease. The *Burgeois de Paris* says that when death visited a house it carried off the majority of the inmates, and especially the young and vigorous. The streets were so deserted that wolves entered the city to carry off dogs and young children; fourteen persons were eaten by them in a week of September, 1438. All at once the people who had produced Marcel and Joan of Arc, and who in the general disorder had become habituated to arms and affairs, began to acquire great weight in the state, whereas two centuries earlier they had been of no importance.

Above the burghers were the remnants of the old feudal aristocracy, the character of which had been greatly changed by a century of constant civil and foreign war. The government, the action of which had been so long suspended, was not more concerned in the armies than the rest of the country. It supplied neither pay, nor food, nor munitions; the soldier had to live by the profits of war, at the cost of the enemy if he could, but more often at the cost of the country. The army was without control, without discipline; it recognised no sovereign but its commander, no law but his will. Those who bore arms received the significant titles of *houspilleurs*, *écorcheurs*, *retondeurs*.[1] Their leaders, who deserve honour as the defenders

[1] These terms are untranslatable: they mean, literally, *abusers*, *extortioners*, *turncoats*.

of France against the foreigner, such men as Etienne de Vignoles, Jean de la Roche, Antoine de Chabannes, Guillaume de Flavy, were cruel and fierce, rough to their enemies, but not less rough towards the peasants and burghers, maltreating the one no less than the other.

While the war produced these lamentable results, it was not the army alone that was corrupted, but a whole class of men, all those who were called gentlemen and who carried a sword. The manners of the camp extended to the castles. John of Luxemburg, in order to teach his nephew the young Count de St. Pol the art of war, entrusted to him the killing of twenty-four prisoners, a task in which he took great delight. The Duke of Brittany put his brother to death, the Duke of Guelders killed his father, the Sieur de Giac his wife, the Countess of Foix her sister, the King of Aragon his son. Giles de Retz carried off children from the country and towns in order to kill them at pleasure and to practise magical arts. This state of things lasted for fourteen years, and at the fortress of Chantocé, where de Retz lived, a full *tonne* of calcined bones was found, the remains of forty children. It is estimated that 140 were killed by this savage monster.

Above this feudal aristocracy there was another aristocracy, that of the princes, whom the crown had itself exalted by making vast appanages for the "royaux de France," as the sons, brothers, and relatives of the king were termed. Thus arose the great houses of Burgundy, Orleans, Anjou, and Bourbon, which combined a spirit of independence, such as was found in the old feudalism, with the pride and pretensions of a royal family, and one of the members of which remarked that he so loved the kingdom of France that in place of one king he would have six.

The King of Bourges, who had now become King of Paris without any great improvement in his position having been effected, found himself in the midst of this troubled society. In the twelfth century, when Louis VI. tried to produce some order in the country, the militia of the communes had rallied round his banner and had bravely assisted in the capture of Le Puiset, Corbeil, La Ferté; from this union of king and people the monarchy and kingdom of Philip the Fair had resulted. In the fifteenth century the French monarchy was restored by the same means. The people in their misery, the king in his weakness, united to secure the triumph of order and justice, to throw down by their joint efforts that aristocratic domination which opposed the unity and well-being of the realm. The king became

the chief revolutionary, for it was rather a revolution than a reform that was effected. It was a rôle which had already been played with success by Philip Augustus, St. Louis, and Philip IV.

Charles VII. proved himself to be a changed man in the second part of his reign. "The fair Agnes," says Brantôme, "seeing that Charles VII. was indolent and lazy, taking no care of his realm, told him one day that when she was still a young girl an astrologer had told her that she would be loved and served by one of the most valiant, one of the bravest kings in Christendom; when the king did her the honour to love her, she thought that he was the valorous king she had heard of. But when she saw he was so indolent, that he took little care for his affairs, she realised that she had been deceived and that the brave king was not Charles VII. but the King of England, who did such great feats of arms and took fair cities by the sword. And she told Charles she would go to seek Henry, since he was the king who had been predicted to her. These words so piqued Charles VII. that he was grieved, and from that time, taking courage and abandoning his hunting and his gardens, he took the bit between his teeth, so that by good fortune and courage he expelled the English from his realm."

Unfortunately this story, and the attractive verses which it inspired Francis I. to write, have no historical foundation. Agnes Sorel did not appear at court until some time after the relief of Orleans, and if any women exercised a salutary influence on the king they were, besides Joan of Arc, his wife Marie of Anjou, and still more his mother-in-law, Yolande of Sicily, a princess of rare energy. An attractive story is lost, but what the picturesqueness of history loses its morality gains.

Brantôme and Francis I. were in accord with the spirit and temperament of their age when they attributed the changed character of the king to the lady of Beauté. It is in accord with modern ideas to point out that Charles VII., always careless in his morals, but trained in public affairs by age and experience, was supported by wise councillors who had great influence over him. Among these advisers were Jean Bureau, his master of artillery; Jacques Cœur, master of finance; Etienne Chevalier, his secretary, who countersigned most of the great ordinances of the reign; William Cousinot, the master of requests, who was so esteemed by the king that when he was taken by the English and his ransom fixed at 20,000 gold crowns, Charles raised the *taille* (tax) by that sum

in order to pay the price. All these men were of humble birth; Agnes also was only the daughter of a burgher or of a squire. Some nobles are found in the royal council, but they belonged to the minor nobility which owed everything to royal favour, such men as Peter and John de Breze, La Hire, Pothon de Xaintrailles, Chabannes, and Dunois. Richmont was the sole exception, but the constable was rather the minister of France than of the king. He was as strong an opponent of the favourites as he was of the English, and by his rapid executions merited the title of the Justiciar. He caused the Sieur de Giac to be drowned, ran through Le Camus de Beaulieu under the eyes of the king, and wounded La Trémoille (1432).

Ordinance of Orleans (1439): The Perpetual Taille.—Reform seemed to be so urgent that its adoption was not even postponed to the end of the war. In October, 1439, Charles assembled the States-General of the north at Orleans, and asked them to aid him in the difficult and bold task of reorganising the army. The states voted 1,200,000 livres to the king for the pay of the soldiers, and Charles made this a permanent tax by continuing to levy it without any renewed grant by the states. On November 2, the king published an ordinance decreeing that, by the advice of the three estates, he kept in his own hands the right of appointing all the captains of France and of fixing the number of their soldiers. The captains were drawn from those who had already served, but it was forbidden under pain of death and forfeiture that the title of captain or of commander of soldiery should be given to any one unless he had been appointed in this way. The captain selected his soldiers up to a number fixed by the king; he was responsible for their conduct; he was obliged to prevent them, under penalty of being himself punished by loss of nobility, death, or forfeiture, from robbing or maltreating the clergy, merchants, and labourers. The soldiers were placed under the jurisdiction of the bailiffs and provosts, and the peasants and burghers were authorised to repel force by force. Each captain was posted in a definite frontier fortress, and was forbidden to leave his station without orders. Barons having soldiers under their orders in their castles maintained them at their own expense and were held responsible for any excesses committed by them. They were forbidden from levying the *taille* or other taxes, except those to which they were entitled from ancient days, under pain of losing their castles.

This ordinance of 1439 was a revolution, since it placed the

armed forces of the realm under the control of the king. This led to intrigues. The lords and the professional soldiers declared that it involved the destruction of all order, and that it was essential to replace such a ruler as soon as possible by his son, the Dauphin Louis, who was then seventeen and who they declared showed precocious ability. They hardly suspected the use to which that ability would later be put.

The Praguerie (1440): Severity towards the Nobles.—The dauphin, already impatient to reign, lent himself willingly to the projects of the nobles. The Dukes of Bourbon and Alençon, the Counts of Vendôme and Dunois, the chief professional soldiers, such as Anthony de Chabannes, the bastard of Bourbon, John Sanglier, John de la Roche, put themselves at the head of the rebellion. It was a rising of all the nobility against the monarchy. Charles VII. was at Poitiers when he was informed that the Duke of Alençon and John de la Roche had surprised the castle of St. Maixant, but that the burghers had taken refuge in the tower of one of the gates where they were still holding out. "Remember Richard II., who shut himself up in a town and was taken," said Richmont to Charles. The king forthwith mounted on horseback and appeared the same night with 400 lances at St. Maixant; he entered by the gate which the burghers held. Throughout Poitou the burghers declared for the king and place after place fell into his hands. These events gave pause to the rebels, and the wiser among them, such as Dunois, hastened to make separate terms. The king was surrounded by 4800 lances, 2000 archers, and the "flying engines" of John Bureau, though he had not recalled one of the garrisons which made steady progress against the English in Normandy. Deserters from the rebels also placed themselves at the disposal of the king. In the Bourbonnais, Auvergne, and Poitou the burghers sided with the crown against the nobles; the states of Auvergne, assembled at Clermont, declared that they belonged wholly to the king, who was the guardian of the poor against the vexations of the soldiery. And they granted him money. The Dukes of Bourbon and Alençon and the dauphin saw that it was necessary not only to submit but also to implore pardon. They came to Charles VII., knelt before him, and prayed for forgiveness. Charles contented himself by saying to his son, "Louis, you have done well to come; you have remained away too long; go to your hotel for to-day, and to-morrow I will talk with you." To the Duke of Bourbon he said, "Good cousin, we are displeased with the offences which you have five

times committed against our majesty; but for our honour and love for others, we would have shown you the displeasure that we feel. Therefore see that your offence is not repeated." Next day Bourbon and the dauphin begged the king to pardon their associates. Charles said that he would do nothing, but that he was ready to permit them to return to their late allies without hindrance. Then the dauphin cried, "Sir, I must return, for I have given my word," and the king answered, "Louis, the gates are open to you, and if they are not wide enough I will have a breach made in the wall for you to pass through wherever you wish. You are my son, and you can be bound to no one without my leave and consent. But go, if you please, for with God's good help we shall find some other of our blood who will better aid us in maintaining our honour and lordship than you have done." The dauphin did not go.

This speedy submission of the rebels and this alliance between the burghers and the crown was a warning for the whole aristocracy. The Duke of Burgundy, who had refused all help to the rebels, felt that he was warned with the rest. He sought to form alliances to guard against so menacing a power, negotiated the release and paid part of the ransom of Duke Charles of Orleans, who had been a prisoner in England since Agincourt, who was the best poet of the age, and who was only set free on payment of £36,000. Philip the Good received the duke with open arms, married him to his niece, and invested him with the Golden Fleece; he sent the collar of the same order to the Dukes of Brittany and Alençon and despatched a long list of complaints to Charles VII. The king, to show that he was ready for all events, advanced to the north and exhibited royal justice on that frontier. He captured and handed over to the provost the bastard of Bourbon, the boldest of the professional soldiers, who, despite his birth, was sewn in a sack and hurled into the river. The king forced the Count of St. Pol to submit the question of the Ligny succession to the parliament of Paris. Meanwhile, the war against the English was carried on with unabated vigour, Meaux and Pontoise in central France and Dieppe in the north being taken from them, while their southern allies, the Counts of Albret, Foix, and Armagnac, were subdued. The English, who had been so haughty at the conference of Arras, were forced to seek a truce from France and the hand of a French princess, Margaret of Anjou, for their young king, Henry VI. (1444). Charles VII. further embarrassed the English by the marriage of

the dauphin with Margaret of Scotland; this union brought a new enemy to the doors of England.

The Ecorcheurs in Switzerland: Battle of St.-Jacques (1444).—Charles had only granted this truce to the English in order that he might complete the work which he had begun in 1439 for the reform of the kingdom. It was necessary, as he said, to take the bad blood from among his soldiers, to send companies of professional soldiers to perish abroad, if not in Spain, as was the case under Charles V., then in Switzerland and Lorraine, where by their death they might perhaps restore the reputation of French arms.

Two demands for help reached Charles simultaneously; Frederic III. sought aid against the Swiss and René of Lorraine against the people of Metz; Charles granted both requests.

Switzerland had founded and consolidated its independence against Austria and the empire by three battles, Morgarten, Sempach, and Näfels, where the peasants' knives had bravely vanquished the great feudal armies. The French nobles were always ready to fight again, but those of Germany were more circumspect, and the Austrian princes were reduced to arming one Swiss canton against another by wretched intrigues, in order that they might then be able to intervene. Now Frederic III. hoped to induce the Armagnacs of Charles VII. to intervene on his behalf.

Charles VII. hastened to send him the army with which he was at a loss to know what to do. It consisted of 14,000 French, 8000 English, Scots, Brabancons, Spaniards, and Italians, commanded by the late leader of the *Praguerie*, the Dauphin Louis. These terrible bands reached the Jura without much confusion, and entered Switzerland, advancing by the little valley of the Birse. The Swiss, who were besieging Zurich, did not wish to let that prize escape them, and sent only 2000 men to meet the enemy. But these were brave and were not content to make a simple reconnaissance. They did not know the strength of their opponents, a messenger who had been sent from Basle to inform them of the numbers of the French was killed by them, and in the brutal pride with which their past victories inspired them they hurled themselves blindly on the first body that they met (1444). Their bravery did not save them, and after making a desperate resistance behind the battered walls of an ancient cemetery, they were driven back and almost annihilated. The dauphin formed such a high opinion of these good fighters that he would not advance farther, but concluded

a treaty of alliance with the Swiss. The soldiers found little profit in so poor a land and turned away into Alsace and Suabia.

Charles VII. in Lorraine.—The king himself commanded the second expedition; many of the nobles followed him; there was talk of vindicating the ancient rights of the crown of France to the lands on the banks of the Rhine. It was too soon for such an attempt; before these districts could be conquered the conquest and unity of France herself had to be achieved. The expedition had no result, the people of Metz making a brave resistance. But the king received the homage of Epinal and showed the banner of France in the valley of the Moselle, where his successors later planted it.

Creation of a Standing Army: Companies of the Ordinance and Free Archers (1445 and 1448).—These two expeditions freed the king of the most mutinous of the adventurers and accustomed the rest to the beginnings of discipline, so that the execution of the ordinance of Orleans became possible. In 1445 the army was reduced to fifteen companies of a hundred lances, each lance implying six paid soldiers, the man-at-arms, his page, three archers, and one swordsman, all mounted. These were placed in garrison in the towns, the larger having twenty or thirty lances, so that the burghers remained more powerful than the soldiery and were able to repress disorders if they arose. The honour of entering these bodies was so great that many old mercenaries agreed to enrol in the companies to secure the first vacancy. All others were forced to return home at once, without disturbance of the public peace, under pain of being handed over to justice as outlaws. Such was the progress of order already that they obeyed and at the end of fifteen days none were left. Those who were enrolled were subjected to strict discipline. Charles VII. thus secured a picked force of 9000 cavalry.

By another ordinance (April 28, 1448) the king gave France a regular and permanent infantry, a force which she had in the past been compelled to hire from the Genoese. Each of the 16,000 parishes of the kingdom were obliged to supply the king with "a good companion," in the words of the ordinance, "who could make war." This body of men was equipped at the expense of the parishes with brigandines (light armour of jointed steel), a helmet, light casque, bow, sword, and dagger or crossbow. They had to exercise every feast-day and to serve the king whenever summoned, receiving four francs a month while on a campaign, with exemption from all *tailles* and subsidies, except the *aides* and the *gabelle*.

The free archer was not a model soldier, since military genius was not born at once in a nation long disarmed. But if Villon gives us the free archer of Bagnolet who falls on his knees before such trees as he mistakes for men-at-arms, begging their pardon and feeling sick at heart, satirical poetry is not always true to history. A century later, in 1544, the free archer, incorporated in the local regiments of Francis I., gained a victory, which the men-at-arms had lost, over the best troops in the world, the old Castillian levies, and after another century, in 1643, the free archer, having exchanged his arquebus for a musket, became the infantryman of Rocroi.

Financial Reform (1443).—All these reforms were subordinate to another, the reform of the finances. Jacques Cœur effected this in 1443. To establish mutual control of the officers of finance over each other, to force the individual receivers to render an account to the receiver-general, and to compel him to do likewise to the chamber of accounts; to force the great officials of the king, the paymaster, squire, treasurer of wars, and the master of artillery, to account every month to the king in person — such measures would to-day appear elementary; they were then admirable reforms. Thanks to these financial measures Charles VII. was able to create in France that which the most powerful of his predecessors had not achieved: a military force depending on the king alone, so that the sovereign was no longer at the mercy of baronial humour as he had so often been. Since the time of Charles V., ordinary indirect taxes, such as the dues on salt, merchandise, and beverages, had in actual fact been permanent. From the time of Charles VII. the land tax or the *taille* for the payment of the men-at-arms became permanent, being continued without a vote of the states. But at the same time the king gave guarantees for the good administration of financial justice by declaring the supremacy of the court of *aides*, which alone had the power to interpret ordinances respecting taxes and the power of final judgment in all civil and criminal cases which originated from finance.

Creation of the Parliaments of Toulouse (1443) and Grenoble (1453).—In 1442 the king made an expedition into Gascony and Languedoc, took some places, and on his return left behind him an institution which was more valuable to him than an army, a parliament which he had established at Toulouse, the jurisdiction of which extended over all Languedoc and the duchy of Guienne (1443). This was the first dismemberment of the

parliament of Paris, but southern claimants gained by not having to seek justice at such a distance; the new parliament became an eye of the monarchy, ever watching over these distant and dissatisfied provinces. The dauphin created the parliament of Grenoble in his lands (1453). An ordinance of 1446 prescribed that in event of a vacancy in the parliament, all the chambers together should nominate two or three candidates, from whom the king would select.

Ordinance for the drawing up of Customs.—It was impossible to attempt in the fifteenth century to create a uniform law for the whole of France; but it was possible to emerge from the chaos of customs and arbitrary power and to produce, especially in northern France, a justice which would supersede unwritten law. Charles VII. thought, to his credit, that all the customs of the kingdom should be written down according to the opinion of the most experienced persons in each district, examined and authorised by the great council and the parliament, so that the authorised text might be no longer modified. This great work was begun.

Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438): End of the Schism (1449).—In 1432 Charles accused Martin V. and Eugenius IV. of favouring the English and of giving benefices to these foreigners; Charles had ordained that no one should receive ecclesiastical preferment if he was not of the realm and loyal to the king. Six years later he went further. Assembling the clergy of France at Bourges, he presented the decrees of the Council of Basle for their acceptance. An ordinance or pragmatic sanction was drawn up according to these decrees, recognising the authority of the general council as superior to the pope; giving the clergy and abbots the right to select their chiefs; forbidding "annates, reservations, and expectancies," and permitting only with the royal approval the publication of papal bulls in France. The Great Schism of the West ended during this reign, when the fathers of Basle declared their obedience to Nicholas V. It had lasted 70 years, had weakened the Church, troubled men's consciences, and prepared the way for the Reformation.

Renewed Hostilities with the English (1449).—All these reforms having been accomplished, Charles found himself strong enough to make an end of hostilities with the English.

A certain Francis of Surienne, an adventurer of Aragon in the service of England, having attempted to take command of a garrison in one of the Norman towns held by the English, was

repulsed, because the soldiers, to whom the government of Henry VI. sent neither pay nor food nor munitions, would not share their already slender resources with a stranger. Francis, finding every gate closed against him, provided for the needs of his men in the manner of the captains of the period, falling, in the midst of peace, upon Fougères, a rich Breton town, and sacking it to pay his soldiers their wages.

Conquest of Normandy (1449).—The King of France and the Duke of Brittany at once demanded reparation from the English governor of Normandy, especially 1,600,000 crowns as damages. It was impossible to grant this demand, and when the indemnity did not arrive the French undertook to collect it for themselves, capturing Pont de l'Arche, Gerberoi, and Verneuil. Dunois entered the province with a strong army, which was joined by the Burgundians and Bretons of their own accord. The towns of Pont Audemer, Lisieux, Mantes, Verhon, Evreux, Louviers, St. Lo, Coutances, and Valognes were taken or surrendered without a blow by the burghers.

England was at this time drifting into the Wars of the Roses, which filled her with blood and ruin for thirty years. Parliament did not dare to attack the king personally, and therefore attacked his minister, the Duke of Suffolk. It was little concerned with the fate of Normandy, since defeats there would be new and victorious arguments to use against the duke. Somerset, the governor of the province, instead of concentrating his forces, spread them in twenty garrisons. He next tried to open negotiations, but, being as incapable in diplomacy as in war, he forgot to give powers to his envoys. That order and ability which had given the English their success were now on the side of the French, and victory came to them also. On October 18, 1449, they appeared before the walls of Rouen.

All the burghers of Rouen took arms against the English, who sought safety in the castle. Somerset was there with the aged Talbot and many lords, officers, and soldiers. But it was still realised that it was impossible to resist both the population and the French army. A truce was concluded on condition that Rouen, Caudebec, Villequier, Lillebonne, Tancarville, and Honfleur, in short all the lower Seine valley, should be ceded to France, and that as a hostage for the fulfilment of these conditions Talbot himself, the English Achilles, should be handed over.

Battle of Formigny (1450).—The governor of Honfleur refused to recognise this capitulation. The town was taken in midwinter

(December, 1449), and Harfleur suffered the same fate. England, driven to extremities, sent Thomas Kyriel, a knight of great renown, with 6000 men. It was her last effort. Kyriel landed at Cherbourg and tried to join Somerset at Bayeux, marching along the coast. The French followed him and (April 15, 1450) made a vigorous attack on him near Formigny, the Constable Richmont assailing one flank and the Count of Clermont the other. Kyriel's troops fought bravely but were defeated, leaving 4000 dead. This enabled the French to forget the 30,000 who had fallen at Crecy and the 12,000 prisoners of Poitiers and Agincourt. Vire, Bayeux, Avranches, Caen, Domfront, and Falaise fell into the hands of Charles VII.

The numerous garrison of Cherbourg thought they had no cause for fear, owing to the strength of the place and its situation on the sea. But the town was taken owing to this very fact. At high tide the French left their cannon anchored on the mole, and at low tide returned to serve them. It was the English at Crecy who had first used these weapons, but the French now knew best how to use them to advantage. Cherbourg surrendered, all Normandy had been conquered in a year. At the same time an unknown discipline appeared in the French army, which had become obedient and lived not on the land but on its pay.

Conquest of Guienne and Bordeaux (1451).—A month later, Dunois, Xaintrailles, Chabannes, and the two brothers, John and Gaspard Bureau, who controlled the French artillery so efficiently, marched against Guienne. Bourg, Blaye, Castillon, Libourne, and St. Emilion were easily taken. The burghers of Bordeaux, so attached to England as the market of their wines, attempted a *sortie*, fled as soon as they saw the enemy, and like the rest entered into negotiations. The French granted almost all their demands (June 5, 1451). The capitulation was not to be carried out for some days, and on the day when it was to be completed the herald in a loud voice demanded help from England for the men of Bordeaux; as no one answered, the gates were opened to the French.

English Expedition to Guienne (1452).—Despite the mildness of the victors, the people of Bordeaux soon regretted that distant English rule which had weighed so lightly on them. They were forced to pay taxes and to furnish soldiers, while their port was deserted and their wines unsold. If an English army, however small, should appear, Bordeaux would throw herself into the arms of England. This army did arrive.

The government of Henry VI., or, more accurately, the government of Margaret of Anjou, needed a great success in order to restore its position at home. Talbot, at the age of eighty, was sent to recover Guienne. His first steps were easy; Bordeaux voluntarily admitted the English (September 22, 1452), and almost the whole country followed suit. The King of France was forced to undertake the reconquest of the province.

Battle of Castillon (1453): End of the Hundred Years' War.—In the spring of 1453 the French army entered Guienne and laid siege to Castillon. The brothers Bureau formed a park of artillery, surrounded the walls, placed their cannon in batteries, and began to beat down the fortifications. Talbot hastened to the rescue. Before attacking he wished to hear mass, and the chaplain had begun the office when it was announced that the enemy were in retreat. "I will hear mass," cried Talbot, "when I have laid low the French," and he ordered the advance. One of his men told him that, so far from retiring, the French were well fortified, and that it was dangerous to attack them. Talbot in anger struck the face of the messenger and continued to advance like a true mediaeval paladin, wearing a cloak of red silk which made him conspicuous from afar. But the days for such feats of arms had passed, and the French cannon struck down the most distinguished knights no less than the simple soldiers. The first volley destroyed complete ranks. Talbot still advanced, but the second volley brought him down. The French then made a sortie, and falling on the English killed 4000 of them.

Next day Castillon surrendered and was followed by St. Emilion, Libourne, Cadillac, and Blanquefort. The French army appeared before Bordeaux; the free archers pillaged the moors, while ships brought from La Rochelle and Brittany blockaded the Gironde. Bordeaux was threatened with famine and sent envoys to Charles VII. In their presence John Bureau said to the king, "Sire, I have visited all the lines to select good places for the cannon; if it is your pleasure, I promise you on my life that in a few days I will demolish the city." The envoys realised that this time they must accept such terms as the king offered them. He took from Bordeaux its privileges, exacted a contribution of 100,000 crowns, and ordered the banishment, with confiscation of their goods, of twenty guilty persons. He further ordered the construction of two citadels to secure the future loyalty of the town. The Sieur de l'Esparré, who had called in the English and who had promised to rouse all the nobles of the district, was executed. On October 19, 1453, Charles VII. entered Bordeaux

in triumph. The Hundred Years' War was ended; in the whole of France the English only held Calais and two small places near it.

Fall of Constantinople (1453): The Vow of the Pheasant.—A great event occurred at this time at the other extremity of Europe. Constantinople, the old empire of the counts of Flanders, the last remains of the Roman Empire, the last barrier against invasion, had fallen, and Mohammed II. launched his light cavalry upon Hungary as far as Friuli. He swore that he would feed his horse on the altar of St. Peter's at Rome. The trembling Italians and the terrified Germans demanded a crusade; all eyes, all hopes, turned to France, who three centuries and a half before had risen as one man to avenge the sufferings of some of her pilgrims. But times had changed. France had hardly risen from the abyss, she was still bruised and bloodless, her desire was only to heal her wounds. One prince, however, answered the urgent appeal of the pope, the great duke of the West as the Duke of Burgundy was called, who had so carefully kept the war from his own lands and at whose court all that remained of chivalry in Europe had gathered. There men talked of tourneys and feats of arms, thought of reviving the days of Amadis and Roland, and in order that all doubt might be removed, Philip founded the Order of the Golden Fleece in the midst of magnificent fêtes. The crusade offered the new knights a good occasion for valiant deeds, a feudal war, chivalrous indeed as being against the Turks.

In the true Middle Ages they would have put on sackcloth and ashes, they would have fasted and prayed, and then have set off full of enthusiasm for Constantinople or Nicaea, Antioch or Jerusalem. At the court of Burgundy in the year 1454 they behaved otherwise; instead of a public fast they had a colossal banquet which would have swallowed up a full year's revenue of the King of France. "At the appointed hour the knights repaired to a hall in which the Duke of Burgundy had ordered a magnificent banquet, and there came many lords accompanied by princes and knights, dames and maidens, who proceeded to survey the side dishes and were greatly edified thereby. In that hall were three covered tables, one middle-sized, one large, and one small. The first contained a church, crossed, glazed, and elegantly fashioned with a real bell and four chanters. Another side dish was in the form of an anchored ship furnished with all kinds of merchandise and manned by tiny sailors; and it seemed that in the largest vessel in the world there could not have been

more work or a greater amount of rigging and sails than in this one."

"The second table, the longest, had in the first place a pie which contained twenty-six live people who played various instruments, each one in turn. The second dish on this table was a castle modelled on the lines of Lusignan; Melusine in the form of a serpent was at the very summit of the highest tower of this castle; from two of the smaller towers orange water gushed out at will, falling into the moat. The third dish was a windmill; the fourth a cask set in the midst of a vineyard; the fifth was a desert over which prowled a tiger marvellously fashioned, which tiger was doing battle with a large serpent. The sixth was a savage mounted on a camel; the seventh the model of a man who with a stick was beating a bush full of small game; the eighth was a fool mounted on a bear; the ninth a lake surrounded by several towns and castles, and upon the lake a sailing vessel floating about on its waters, and this vessel was exquisitely fashioned and well furnished with all the accessories of a ship."

"But to describe the service and the dishes, that would indeed be marvellous to tell, also I had so many other things to look at that I could hardly describe them accurately; but this much I remember, that each dish was furnished with forty-eight kinds of meats and that there were roasts in the form of waggons decorated with gold and azure."

"By the door through which all the side dishes were brought in and taken out entered a giant who, without the aid of art, was taller by a good foot than any man I had ever seen. He was attired in a long robe of green silk, striped in several places, and his head was adorned with a turban in the manner of the Moors of Granada; in his left hand he held a long and heavy sword of the old style and his right led an elephant draped with silk, on whose back was erected a castle which contained a lady dressed in the fashion of a nun in white satin, over which she wore a cloak of black cloth, and on her head a white kerchief after the manner of a Burgundian or a recluse. As soon as she entered the hall and saw the noble company who were gathered there, as if impelled to do so, she cried to the giant who led her,

"'Giant, I wish you to stay
For I see a noble company
To whom I must speak.
Giant, I wish you to stay,
Tell their wishes and bring to light
Things which must be known.'

"This woman was the Holy Church coming to implore the help of the knights of Burgundy. She delivered to those present a long and unpoetical plaint. Twelve virtues, represented by twelve ladies did likewise. Then the king at arms, Golden Fleece, entered holding a pheasant richly adorned with a collar of gold, pearls, and precious stones, and Duke Philip the Good made a vow, first to God and the Virgin and then to the ladies and the pheasant, to go and fight against the Turk. All those present followed his example and outbid each other; one vowed he would not do less than take the Grand Turk alive or dead, another that he would never again wear armour on his right arm; this one swore never to sit down to table on Tuesdays, that one never to return home until he had thrown a Turk with his legs in the air." (Olivier de la Marche, tome ii. p. 167.)

They should have guarded against the danger of mistaking all these extravagances for enthusiasm. At the height of their knightly ardour, and even before the sumptuous banquet which the Duke of Burgundy had just given them, the crusaders of the fifteenth century preserved their *sangfroid*. Each one carefully stipulated every ground which might excuse him from fulfilling his vow, and even if he had no excuse, his vow was not to be performed until the duke had fulfilled his. But the Duke of Burgundy had sworn that he would march to the defence of the Christian faith, only "provided that it was with the pleasure and consent of my lord the king, and that the land which God has committed to my care be in peace and security." In virtue of this prudent restriction the Duke of Burgundy did not go, no one went, no one had ever seriously intended to go.

Renewed Feudal Intrigues.—The feudal aristocracy was far more concerned with the progress of the French monarchy than with that of the Turk, since the French crown made laws instead of feasts and tourneys, organised finance, reformed the army, and expelled the English. The Duke of Burgundy had become distrustful of the crown almost from the moment of the Treaty of Arras; he had attempted to ally himself with the Duke of Orleans whom he had hastily delivered from the hands of the English, and to whom, as well as to the heads of the great families of the realm, he sent the collar of the Golden Fleece. Without a breach with the French king he gave support to all the malcontents, one of whom, the Duke of Alençon, had already offered to open his gates to the English if they cared to undertake a new invasion. The king caused him to be arrested by Dunois (1456); he was tried and condemned to death, prince of the blood though

he was, and only escaped the extreme penalty at the cost of perpetual imprisonment. Another baron, John of Armagnac, openly guilty of incest and bigamy, also intrigued with the English; a royal army seized his lands and the parliament exiled him (1455).

Flight of the Dauphin and the Duke of Burgundy (1456).—The king's most dangerous enemy was the heir to the throne, the Dauphin Louis, who at the age of seventeen had been the head of a great aristocratic plot against his father. To occupy his mind Charles had sent him to Dauphiné, his domain, where he was able to plot day and night, devising, says the chronicler, "many strange things." He plotted so much that he roused the land; many of his changes were certainly beneficial, but he changed for the sake of change, lavishing titles of nobility so that the expression "nobles of the Dauphin Louis" became proverbial. Despite his father, he married Charlotte of Savoy; he intrigued with every one, the king's ministers and his enemies, the Dukes of Alençon and Burgundy; he attempted to win over Jacques Cœur, favoured all who were hateful to Charles VII., and was as threatening and disquieting in Dauphiné as he had been in France.

The government of Charles VII. showed in these circumstances all the vigour which it knew so well how to display. Anthony de Chabannes, the former chief of the mercenaries, advanced with a body of troops to the frontier of Dauphiné, while the king himself went with an army to Lyons. The dauphin, disconcerted by this activity, wrote respectfully to Charles VII. that being, by his father and lord's permission, standard-bearer to the holy see, he was unable to refuse the request of the pope that he should join his good uncle of Burgundy, who was about to march against the Turks in defence of the Catholic faith. Having done this, he mounted with six of his men and rode at full speed to Franche-Comté, where he demanded the protection of the Duke of Burgundy. At the news of the good reception which Louis received from Philip the Good, Charles VII. remarked, "He has received the fox who will eat his chicken."

The fox showed at least that he could be humble and modest. He proclaimed himself a victim, recounted all the sorrows that he had endured so lamentably that the duke and duchess and the whole court wept, except perhaps the Count of Charolais. His hosts heaped honours and money on him; they were entirely at his disposal, refusing him nothing except an army to lead against his father. It was not good-will that was lacking,

but the duke, already very old, wished to end his life in peace. A war against France would have disturbed everything; it would have been needful to increase the taxes, which would possibly have caused rebellions in those terrible Flemish communes so ready to rise; Philip would have had to abdicate in effect by handing over the leadership of his army to his son, who was on almost as bad terms with his father as Louis was with Charles VII. Nor was it clear that in a prolonged struggle the Burgundian possessions, so strangely composed of French and Flemish territories, of communal and feudal lands, would hold together. The duke feared war on all grounds.

Death of Charles VII. (1461).—There was unrest at the court of France. Louis, in his refuge at Genappe, intrigued in the whole realm, wrote the most submissive letters to his father, but really aimed at estranging him from his ministers and at securing control of the latter. Charles VII. thought for a moment of giving the crown to his second son, and even secretly consulted Pope Pius II. on this point, for it was already said that those who offended Louis would not live long, witness Agnes Sorel and the dauphin's wife, the accomplished and clever Margaret of Scotland. This charge was untrue, but Charles believed his son to be capable of anything, and feared poison for himself. He was weakened by his irregular life, which had not ceased when he reached later years. An abscess formed in his mouth, an incurable ill which caused him great pain. In his weakened condition, filled with the fears that had formed in his mind, he refused all nourishment, possibly the nature of his illness prevented him from taking any, and so he died (July 22, 1461).

Jacques Cœur.—Two acts of ingratitude and wrong burden the reputation of Charles VII.; the cowardly abandonment of Joan of Arc to the English and the condemnation of Jacques Cœur. This great citizen was at first a merchant who from his journeys in Italy and the Levant had learned the secret of the wealth of the Italian cities. He imitated them by seeking the wealth of the East in Syria and Egypt, and his numerous ships traversed the Mediterranean. Summoned by Charles VII., who had known him at Bourges, to the position of royal treasurer or administrator of the demesne revenues, he was concerned for twelve years in the most important affairs of state, and showed in the royal council his clear mind and severe probity as in the management of his private affairs. The war became more and more costly; he was able at all times to supply the needed resources, dipping in his own coffers when the

king's were empty. He lent Charles VII. the funds for the recovery of Normandy, 20,000 gold crowns, telling the king, "All mine is yours." The courtiers took him at his word, and at the end of a hateful trial which they instituted against him, his spoils were divided and he was shut up in the convent of Beaucaire. But his old servants united to deliver him by force, and took him to Rome where the pope received him with great honour (1455). He died in the following year at Chois, of wounds received in fighting against the Turks. His house at Bourges still exists, one of the most curious examples of the architecture of the fifteenth century. Jacques Cœur not only opened a new route for French commerce, but also established relations between France and the Mohammedan princes, the Sultan of Egypt sending an envoy to Charles VII. in 1447. The effect of this policy was seen in the time of Francis I.

Another financier, John de Xaincoings, receiver-general of the kingdom, was condemned in 1454 to imprisonment and forfeiture for having taken great and excessive sums of the king's revenues. The splendid house that he had built at Tours was given by Charles VII. to Dunois.

It is not clear that Xaincoings was any more guilty than Jacques Cœur. The feudal aristocracy only esteemed profits made by the sword and loved to revenge themselves for the greater ability of men of business and their rapid rise to fortune, not always too scrupulously acquired. In the next age Semblancy suffered the fate of Enguerrand de Marigny; in the seventeenth century, Fouquet suffered that of Xaincoings; and the financiers, merchants, and traders had long to submit to the contempt of the nobles before they took their place.

Alan Chartier.—The Battle of Agincourt cost France an excellent poet, Charles of Orleans, who wiled away his long exile in England by cultivating poetry. Curiously enough, in the melodious verse of the prince, there is no memory of France, not a word about his misfortunes. The misery of the people which had filled the heart of Joan of Arc penetrated also the patriotic soul of a young Norman poet, Alan Chartier. "Men," he made France cry to her children in his *Quadriloge*, "men who are equipped with the faculty of right thinking, women of courage and good sense, far from virtue, you have forgotten the constancy of your ancestors, in order that you may live pleasantly you are ready to die in shame. What trifling, puny spirit keeps your hands idle and makes your will feeble?" There is true eloquence in this lofty and proud language, and if

he had always written as well, Alan Chartier would have deserved the surname of the *Father of French Eloquence* and a respect more sincere and real than he received. "One day," says Stephen Pasquier, "Margaret of Scotland, the wife of the dauphin, who was afterwards Louis XI., passing with a great following of ladies and lords through a hall where Chartier was sleeping, went and kissed him on the lips, at which many marvelled, for, truth to tell, nature had endowed him with a great spirit in an ugly body. Margaret told them that they need not be surprised at this mystery, since she had not kissed the man but the lips from which such precious words issued."

End of the Middle Ages.—The reign of Charles VII. marks the end of the Middle Ages in France and the beginning of modern times. In the ages which had passed, nothing of importance, save the Investiture Controversy and the Great Charter in England, had originated outside France or taken place without her. Germany had been involved in the struggle between the papacy and the empire, but that struggle ended with Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair. France had been the foremost feudal state, had begun the crusades and chivalry, scholasticism and pointed architecture, and had founded the bourgeoisie. Under Charles VIII. she restored the Roman system of a standing army and permanent taxation; under Louis XI. she completed the destruction of the feudal aristocracy. The other states of Europe followed her example, but as she had led the way, so she profited most from the changes, and as she had been the leading power of the continent during the feudal period, so she was also the leading power in the monarchical period.

It is worth while to note, at the moment when the age of fiefs and communes and provinces gives way to the age of the state, when the idea of privilege is replaced by the idea of equality, at first an equality of obedience and later an equality of freedom, that these Middle Ages, so full of misery and grief, often showed a spirit of sturdy independence unknown in the succeeding epoch. In modern times there is more order, more material prosperity; it may be doubted whether in three hundred years they have shown more true dignity than was shown in some of the castles and cities of France.

CHAPTER XXXIV

LOUIS XI. TO THE DEATH OF HIS BROTHER (1461–1472)

Return and Coronation of the King.—Feudalism believed itself saved by the accession of the dauphin, Louis XI., the former ally of the nobles, and at that very time the guest, friend, and intimate of the Duke of Burgundy. The new king could only do in all things the exact contrary of his father. All the nobles in Burgundy and the Low Countries were mounted to form his escort. Philip the Good declared that he was willing to accompany the king to his coronation at Reims with 100,000 men. Louis found the number too large. "Why does my dear uncle of Burgundy wish to gather so many men," he asked; "am I not king? What have I to fear?" They went none the less, all covered with velvet and gold and jewels, their rich banners floating in the breeze, and 149 waggons bearing after them vessels of gold and silver and wines. In the midst of the gorgeous crowd was the duke in person, surrounded by an army of pages and servants, and wearing the mien of an emperor.

The appearance of the king was very different. He was so poorly clad and so humble in his speech that the true king appeared to be the Duke of Burgundy. But the duke was the king's protector and had at least guarded him from persecution. Louis could therefore refuse him nothing; he gave him, as a mark of honour, the right of nominating twenty-four councillors of the parliament, none of whom, it is true, ever sat in that body. He was granted free transit of merchandise from one frontier to the other, subject to the registration of this concession by the parliament, a registration which did not take place. The Duke of Alençon was pardoned for his sake, but Louis kept control over the children and fortresses of the pardoned duke. The Duke of Burgundy returned home, loaded with honours and at the same time ruined.

Then Louis XI. felt that he was at home, and forthwith set to work on the true labour of his reign, a reign which, whatever judgment may be passed on the king, must be regarded as one of the most important in the history of France.

Strength of the Feudal Party.—The reign opened in circumstances which, as far as foreign affairs were concerned, were most fortunate. Not one of the states bordering on France was

in a position to interfere with any of the projects of Louis XI. England was in the midst of the terrible Wars of the Roses and was unable for a long time to intervene effectually in the affairs of France. Spain was divided; Germany was rendered powerless by her anarchical constitution; Italy had long since ceased to be a danger to any one.

But if Louis XI. was sure of not meeting any serious embarrassment abroad, at home he was faced by many difficulties; feudalism was still powerful. At the head of the feudal party stood an aristocracy of appanaged princes, relations, more or less near, of the king; powerful families, rich from their vast demesnes, proud from their origin, and dangerous owing to their claims to independence. They formed, as it were, a collection of small states placed on the flanks of the kingdom. The house of Brittany had its old traditions of liberty and its friendly relations with England. The house of Bourbon held five or six great provinces in the heart of France, the Bourbonnais, Auvergne, Forez, Beaujolais, Dombes, Roannais, Montpensier, Vendôme, and other districts. The house of Anjou held Anjou, Maine, and Provence, but was, fortunately for the French crown, weakened by the dispersion of its lands and by its ambition which led it to aim at nothing less than the crowns of Spain, Sicily, Italy, and Jerusalem. The house of Orleans held Paris blockaded by its possessions of Dreux, Ham, Coucy, La Fère, Crespi, Verberie, and Orleans. The house of Alençon held Alençon and Perche, that of Artois held Eu. Finally there was the house of Burgundy, with all its possessions and dependencies, the county and duchy of Burgundy, counties of Rethel and Nevers, Artois, Flanders, Hainault, Brabant, Holland, Zeeland, Friesland, the counties of Macon and Auxerre, the castles of Roye, Peronne and Montdidier, and the Somme towns, St. Quentin, Amiens, Abbeville, and St. Valery, and lastly exemption from all homage, appeal, and sovereignty, the concession made by the Treaty of Arras.

Below these great houses were the families of Penthièvre, holding Limoges and Périgord; of Foix, Armagnac; and Albret, holding almost everything south of the Garonne to the Pyrenees; La Trémoille in Poitou; St. Pol in Picardy; Montmorency, Laval, La Tour, Clermont-Tonnerre; and Châlon, which ruled Neufchâtel in Switzerland, Orange, and other places.

Hasty Reforms: Popular Discontent: Dissatisfaction in the University and the Parliament.—Feudalism was rendered more dangerous by the fact that it realised the critical nature of its

position. "Our lord the king is dead; let each look to himself," said Dunois, when Charles VII. expired. They did not despair of reducing the monarchy to the position which it had occupied under the first Capetians. Louis XI., by his hasty reforms, gave the feudal party a host of allies. He dismissed the majority of his father's officials and restored those who had been displaced, the Alençons and Armagnacs. The people expected a reduction of taxation to mark the accession; the perpetual *taille* was raised from 1,800,000 to 3,000,000 livres, and a riot having occurred at Reims, Louis caused a good number of the burghers to be hanged or expelled; the figures of those who were hanged were sculptured on one of the cathedral towers. The king forbade the University of Paris to concern itself with the affairs of the king and city, closed its classes, and thus turned into the streets 25,000 students all ready for a riot. The parliament was no better treated; the king removed the chamber of accounts from its jurisdiction and reduced the extended jurisdiction of the parliaments of Paris and Toulouse by creating at their expense in 1462 the parliament of Bordeaux. He had already, in 1453, created the parliament of Grenoble; he later founded that of Dijon.

Discontent of the Clergy: Revocation of the Pragmatic Sanction.—The clergy were no better satisfied. The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges appeared to Louis to give too much liberty to the clergy and too much power to the nobles; he revoked it, as Francis I. did at a later date, despite the request of parliament for its maintenance. He also demanded from the clergy a schedule of all their goods, in which were contained the smallest pieces of land, with their titles of ownership, proof of acquisition, rent-rolls due, in such a way that, as the ordinance says, the clergy could no longer trespass on the rights of king or his vassals.

Discontent of the Nobles.—The aristocracy was still more seriously threatened. It saw the king grant titles of nobility to the consuls of small towns and to the mayors of boroughs, and to prevent this rustic nobility from engaging in the sports of the aristocracy he forbade hunting to every one save the princes, under penalty of loss of limb and forfeiture. But the king who despised the first of feudal rights suddenly revived all the claims of feudal law to duties which had been obsolete for many years. He claimed *aides*, reliefs, wardship, forfeitures, drawing up a long list of old dues and demanding immediate payment. He might still have escaped if he had spared the greater families. But he

deprived the house of Breze of the seneschalship of Normandy and the house of Bourbon of the government of Guienne, giving the latter to a member of the house of Anjou that the two families might be embroiled with each other. He also removed his brother Charles from the government of Berry. Louis had various disputes with the house of Brittany as to appeals to the parliament of Paris to which the duke would not consent; on the question of feudal dues which the duke refused to pay; and as to the nomination of bishops which the duke would not leave to Louis. The king forbade him to coin money or to levy *taille* in his province.

Acquisition of Cerdagne and Rousillon (1462): Redemption of the Somme Towns (1463).—In 1463 Louis XI. fixed his residence on the northern frontier, going from one town to another, making frequent visits to the old Duke of Burgundy, sending the queen and the princesses to him, and employing every means to win him over. The king had a great project on foot, the redemption of the Somme towns, mortgaged by the Treaty of Arras. By lending 200,000 crowns to the King of Aragon, who was then greatly embarrassed, he received in pledge the districts of Cerdagne and Rousillon (1462). He felt sure that he would retain them, but he was still more anxious to regain the towns which his father had abandoned to secure the Burgundian alliance. The old duke, continuously pressed and always short of money as a result of his extravagance, promised to accept the ransom of these towns. When he made this promise he still hoped that it would not be possible for the king to find the 400,000 crowns required. Louis raised the sum in a few days; he would have emptied the purses of all his good towns rather than not pay the sum. On September 12 he sent the duke 200,000 crowns; on October 8 he sent the balance, and the important Somme barrier was once more in his possession.

League of the Public Good (1465).—The Count of Charolais, the violent son of the Duke of Burgundy, did not forgive this concession which had been won from his father's old age. He had also other grounds of complaint; the king had given him the lieutenancy of Normandy which he had already granted to the Duke of Brittany. The count was not a good son; Louis had proposed to Philip to bring him to reason.

Louis had not reigned four years before every one was opposed to him. The people, forced to contribute heavily to the necessities of the government, the nature of which they did not understand; the burghers, wounded in their private interests, which

they did not know how to sacrifice to the common good; the clergy, whose property was threatened; the lesser nobles, menaced with the loss of their rights and of their most cherished customs; the higher nobles, whose sovereign rights were impeached; all these classes, divorced from each other, so often hostile to each other, momentarily found themselves in accord in a wish to limit and reduce the royal authority.

Louis, who only realised this general hostility when it was too late to prevent its growth, attempted to calm the storm by a new measure, which, as was the case in all that he did, was directed to influence public opinion. He assembled the deputies of the cities of the north at Rouen, and before these simple burghers he undertook a formal justification of his conduct. He next assembled the princes, talked to them with his wonderful eloquence, laid his whole life bare before them, the exile which he had suffered, the miseries which he had endured, the difficulties which had faced him on his accession, and then set forth the good which he had done in a kingdom so embarrassed. He pointed to the existence of good order, the restoration of security, the territory gained in Rousillon, Cerdagne, and the Somme towns, and alluded to the wearisome journeys which he had made, journeys such as no King of France since Charlemagne had made in so short a time. The royal speech touched and moved the lords; they declared that never had any one spoken so well in French and swore that they would always be with the king, their bodies and goods at his service. The meeting was hardly over when the lords prepared means for an attack on Louis, raising against him his brother the Duke of Berry, a young man of eighteen, who was to be their leader.

The princes declared that this armed rising against royal power was the League of the Public Good and that they were actuated by sorrow for the misfortunes of the realm under the anarchical and pitiful rule of Louis XI. The king having written to the Duke of Bourbon, asking him to come to his help with a hundred lances, the duke answered by a long letter, saying that "the princes of the blood and of royal lineage had considered the state in which they were, both with regard to the justice, police, and government of the realm and to the excessive burdens laid on the poor, who had to bear insupportable charges, vexations, and interference; that the princes were agreed that they should assemble together to tell him with one voice that these things were so, that they might produce order and discipline such as had not been since the king's accession."

Louis counted also on the aged Duke of Burgundy, but (March 12, 1465) Philip the Good fell into that state of mental weakness which endured for the two years longer that he lived and Charles the Rash or Bold, Count of Charolais, on the same day assumed the government of the duchy.

On the following day (March 13, 1465) the Duke of Bourbon published his answer to the king and two days later the Duke of Berry issued a manifesto against his brother's administration. On March 22, Francis II., Duke of Brittany, declared that he was the foe of all foes of the Duke of Burgundy, not excepting the king. The hostile declarations of the nobles followed; every one had joined the League of the Public Good.

Louis XI. considered that it would be difficult for all these princes, lords, districts, and armies to organise concerted action, that he might overcome his difficulties by activity. His plan was well formed. He proposed to hold Charles the Bold in the north and Francis II. in the west, or at least to hinder their advance on Paris, and to profit by this to reduce the Duke of Bourbon and the rebels of the south, crushing them between his own army and the Italian troops which his ally, Francesco Sforza, was sending to him and the help which would be rendered him by his good friends, the lords of Armagnac and Nemours. He would then return and defeat in succession the Dukes of Brittany and Burgundy, who would not yet have been able to unite.

Battle of Montlhéry (1465).—The king entered the campaign with that disciplined army which his father had bequeathed to him. Avoiding Bourges, the capture of which would have taken time, he took St. Amand, Montluçon, Sancerre, Gannat, and Riom, offering battle to the princes, who did not dare to accept it, and imposing on them new oaths of fealty which they would break as soon as they saw the king's difficulties increase. And those difficulties did increase incessantly. Louis relied on the Count of Armagnac and the Duke of Nemours, whom he had loaded with gifts and honours; they both came, but it was to join the rebels.

The same treason was found in the west and north. The Count of Maine, ordered to oppose the Breton forces, retired before them along the Loire. The Duke of Nevers, instructed to defend the barrier of the Somme against the Burgundians, handed this gate of France over to them. On July 5 Charles the Bold, without having met a single obstacle, arrived before Paris, proclaiming everywhere that he would abolish the *taille* and the *gabelle*.

The question was whether Paris would side with the princes. This was a matter of life and death for Louis, who, leaving the Bourbonnais and the rebels of the south, was anxious only to re-enter the capital, believing himself lost if he failed to do so. His biographer states that in such a case he would have retired to Switzerland or to Francesco, the Duke of Milan, whom he regarded as his great friend. He wrote to the Parisians that their city was dearer to him than all else; that he would entrust the queen to them; that she wished her child to be born among them; that he was himself coming and would be with them without fail on July 16.

Paris appeared little moved by these royal flatteries. The most influential body, the University, made many processions and had many sermons preached, but vetoed the suggestion of the arming of the students, pleading its privileges. The burghers and the people showed a like coolness. Louis XI. had strong reasons for haste and his reasons were increased by the slow advance of the Dukes of Berry and Brittany; it was essential to arrive before them.

On the morning of July 16 the king was at Montlhéry, where the Burgundians barred his way. He passed through them, while Charolais did likewise with the royalist left wing, so that there were neither victors nor vanquished, but a crowd of fugitives. "On the side of the king," says Comines, "there was a statesman who fled as far as Lusignan in Poitou and on the count's side a man of property who fled as far as Quesnoi in Hainault." The king attained his object. Leaving the count to sound fanfares on the battlefield to prove conclusively that he was victorious, the king hastened to enter Paris, where he armed the burghers, accepted the help of six citizens, six members of the parliament, and six clerks of the University as a council, and attempted by these means to secure Paris, believing that if he held Paris he would hold France whatever might befall.

Among the rebels nothing was done in co-operation or in haste. The young Dukes of Berry and Brittany, "who," says Comines, "from fear of fatigue, wore satin cuirasses made to look like steel, with gilded nails worked on them, came very slowly, and when all were arrived, Bretons, Gascons, and Lorrainers, jealousies appeared and hatred. The Duke of Berry, heir to the throne, already excited distrust, especially in the mind of Charolais, who laughed at his weakness and at the pity which he showed for the dead and wounded. 'Have you heard this man talk?' said the impetuous count. 'He was sorry for the fate of

seven or eight hundred men whom he saw wounded, who were nothing to him, who were unknown to him ; he would be sorry enough if the matter touched him personally and is just the man to make terms quickly and leave his allies in the lurch. Therefore it is well that he should be provided with friends.' "

Treaties of Conflans and St. Maur (1465).—Though Louis XI. was personally very brave, he preferred battles of wit, the use of finesse and stratagem. He negotiated and discussed continuously, seeking to divide the barons who were already on such doubtful terms, considering neither money nor promises. The league was achieving nothing, some of its members being already anxious to sell themselves to the king. These negotiations took place between Charenton and St. Antoine ; each proved to have his price and much was done. The Count of Armagnac, the Duke of Nemours, the Count of St.. Pol, John of Calabria came in ; one demanded money, another lands, another the constable's sword ; nothing was refused, and the king saw the league already dissolved by his skill, the Dukes of Brittany and Burgundy left isolated and possibly hostile to each other.

Unfortunately for the king, he could not be everywhere at once and wherever he was not he was betrayed. On September 21 Pontoise went over to the princes ; Rouen, Évreux, Caen, Beauvais, and Peronne did likewise, and the movement threatened to involve Paris. Louis saw that the negotiations must be accelerated. " The king came one morning to our host, having a force of cavalry on the bank but in his boat only four or five persons besides those who rowed him. The Counts of Charolais and St. Pol stood on the river bank on their side awaiting the king. Louis demanded of Charolais, ' Brother, will you give me a safe-conduct ? ' the count having married the king's sister. The count answered, ' Yes, sire, as a brother.' The king landed ; the counts did him great honour, as was right, and he, never sparing of words, began the conversation, saying, ' My brother, I know that you are a gentleman and of the house of France.' ' How so ? ' asked the count. ' When I sent my ambassadors to Lille a little while ago to my uncle, your father, and to you, that fool Morviller spoke so well to you that you demanded by the Archbishop of Narbonne that I should withdraw the words Morviller had said before the end of the year. You have been as good as your word and it is still far from the end of the year.' Louis said this smiling and laughing, knowing the character of those to whom he spoke and that they would like such speech ; and pleased they certainly were. Then

he added that he delighted to deal with such men who kept their word."

Peace was speedily concluded by the treaties of Conflans with Charolais (October 5) and that of St. Maur with the princes (October 29). "The Normans want a duke," said the king. "Well, they shall have one." The duke was his brother, to whom he gave Normandy increased by the county of Eu and the duchy of Alençon and with it the right of nomination to offices, ecclesiastical rights, and so forth. All the rest were equally gratified. The Duke of Burgundy received Boulogne, Guines, Roye, Montdidier, and the Somme towns. The Duke of Brittany received Étampes and exemption from appeals to the parliament, release from feudal dues, and the right of coining money; in a word, a small independent kingdom. The Duke of Lorraine received the march of Champagne free from homage, Mouzon, Ste. Menehould, and Neufchâtel, lands to the value of 30,000 crowns. The Dukes of Bourbon and Nemours, the Counts of Armagnac, Dunois, Dammartin, the Sieur d'Albret, and many others acquired domains, pensions, and promises for the future. Typical of those promises was that to the Count of Charolais that he, being now thirty, should one day marry the king's daughter who was two, and should receive in dower Champagne, Langres, Sens, Laon, and Vermandois. While waiting for this dower Charles demanded and secured Ponthieu. The princes, says Comines, sacked the monarchy and took pillage.

All this seemed to have little to do with the public good. It was necessary to lend an air of doing something for the standard which they had raised and Count Dunois was selected to preside over thirty-six notables charged to inquire into the faults and disorders of the government, with full power to remedy them by an ordinance which the king was to ratify within fifteen days.

Revolts in the Duchy of Burgundy: Recovery of Normandy by the King (1466).—Had this treaty been executed strictly, the kingdom of France would have been ruined, but it was certain that Louis XI. would not execute it if it were possible to do otherwise; already the parliament, under his influence, had declined to register it. Warned, however, by the hard experience through which he had passed, Louis resolved not to proceed so hastily in future and only to undertake one affair at a time. He had relied too much on force; the League of the Public Good showed him the full extent of the greed and treachery with

which he was surrounded. For the future he was more prudent, though his prudence used all means, ruses, perfidy, and cruelty.

The cession of Normandy was a special danger, since by this province the domains of the Dukes of Brittany and Burgundy joined, and all the coasts from Dunkirk to Nantes were laid open to the English. Louis from the first moment considered means for its recovery. The Duke of Brittany and the new Duke of Normandy who were near neighbours became also enemies; Louis promised to reconcile them like the judge in the fable. But it was essential to prevent Charolais from interfering, and this the king and the circumstances accomplished, three revolts occurring at Liége, Dinant, and Ghent simultaneously.

Liége, bounded by the Burgundian estates, was a free city under its bishop, who at this time was Louis of Bourbon, the duke's nephew, a young man with a taste only for pleasure and for the money which his pleasures demanded. Liége became discontented under such a government; the King of France supported the insurrection, promising help; and the people of Liége, though they hardly needed encouragement, expelled their bishop, attacked the Burgundian possessions in Limburg, and provoked a war which became serious. Dinant followed the example of Liége and hurled insults at the "old dotard of a duke" and his son, Charlotteau, which could only be wiped out in blood. Finally a rebellion broke out at Ghent in which the liberty and even the life of Charles the Bold was threatened.

There was thus enough to occupy the attention of Charles for some time and Louis had no fear of being disturbed in his projects. He at once sent the Duke of Brittany 120,000 gold crowns to induce him to leave his old ally to his fate, and then invaded Normandy. In a few weeks the whole province was in his power, the Duke of Burgundy having been able to do nothing but write mildly to the king. The king answered that he had been compelled to act as he had done, whether he would or no; that his brother and the Normans could not agree; that an ordinance of Charles V. formally forbade the cession of this particular province and he had thus no right to grant it as an appange; finally that he trusted that at his recommendation the duke would be ready to treat the poor people of Liége and Dinant gently (1466).

Charles the Bold could neither answer nor act, and the chiefs of the other princely houses would not move. The king had either won them over or neutralised them. The house of Bourbon had been gained by the gift to Duke John of a whole realm

in the centre of France—Berry, Orleans, Limousin, Périgord, Quercy, Rouergue, and Languedoc; while his brother, Peter de Beaujeu, received the king's daughter Anne in marriage, and the bastard of Bourbon became Admiral of France and Governor of Honfleur. The house of Anjou had been conciliated by the gift to John of Calabria, son of René, of 120,000 livres which he needed for his adventures; the house of Orleans by the securing of Dunois, the old hero of the English wars. Louis had finally won over the Count of St. Pol, the friend of his youth and the confidant of Charles the Bold, by making him constable of the kingdom, Captain of Rouen, and Governor of Normandy.

The king attached the burghers to him with as much care as he used towards the princes. To those of Paris, especially, he granted permanency of their offices and exemption from all taxes; he armed them to the number of 60,000 or 80,000 men and carefully fortified the city. He lived almost as a citizen of Paris himself, dining without ceremony with Denis Hesselin, calling him his friend and standing as godfather to one of his children; sending the Queen and the Duchess of Bourbon to dine with the first president, Dauvet; going nearly every day to mass at Notre-Dame and taking care to leave always some rich offering. The burghers, like the princes, began to side with this king who gave them everything.

New Coalition against the King (1467).—No one dared to dispute the possession of Normandy with the king. Charles the Bold, who became Duke of Burgundy by the death of his father, was isolated and alone; despite his great power he could do nothing. He therefore sought allies abroad. Though a Lancastrian by his mother, he had married the sister of Edward IV. of England, who sent him 500 Englishmen and offered him a fleet. He found another ally in Francis II. of Brittany, who after helping Louis to recover Normandy from his brother, had become alarmed at the king's rapid success and turning once more against him had seized Caen and Alençon, from which he threatened the rest of the province. He also called in the aid of the English and offered them their choice of twelve towns.

States-General of Tours (1468).—In face of this new peril, Louis appealed to the opinion of France. On April 6, 1468, he assembled the States-General of the kingdom at Tours and asked them bluntly whether they wished Normandy to be part of the demesne of the crown. If it were given to the king's brother, it was given to the Dukes of Burgundy and Brittany and to their

allies the English. The States answered that neither from fraternal affection, nor by reason of a promise, nor from threat of war, nor from regard to any earthly danger ought the king to agree to the separation of the duchy of Normandy or allow it to pass into the hand of any living man save himself.

They added that, according to law, Charles of Berry was entitled to an appange of 12,000 livres a year only, with the title of duke or count, and that since the king was ready to grant him 60,000 livres, he ought to be well content. As for the Duke of Brittany, he should be summoned to evacuate the towns he had seized, and if he did not do so, he should be expelled by force. Finally the States resolved to send an envoy to the Duke of Burgundy to inform him of their decision and to ask him to aid the king in the work of restoring good justice throughout the realm.

Treaty of Ancenis with the Duke of Brittany (1468).—Charles the Bold received the message with a contempt which Louis took care to make known throughout France, but before he could act the king by the rapidity of his blows had compelled the Duke of Brittany to treat at Ancenis (September 10).

The Interview of Peronne (1468).—The king, freed from the Bretons and having an excellent army under his command, might surely have accepted the struggle with the Duke of Burgundy. But an English fleet and army was assembled at Portsmouth ready to cross, and Louis was eager at all costs to keep the English in their own island. He had no liking for battles, where so much depended on chance, cowardice, and treason; he remembered the great defeats of the two preceding centuries, when the outcome of one day had ruined a reign; he felt that he was surrounded by traitors; he had recently executed Charles of Melun, grand master of France, who had abandoned him at Montlhéry. He further realised his mental superiority to his rival, and counted on securing by negotiation all the fruits of a victory. But for this, it was necessary that he should go in person. Some feared that he would be in danger if he placed himself in the hands of the duke. Louis feared nothing; the grand master of the Golden Fleece, the very foremost of the knights, could not be guilty of a public act of treachery. The king also took precautions. He obliged the duke to accept his money for the expenses of the war, or at least half the sum offered; he demanded a safe-conduct, which contained the terms that "You may come and stay and reside surely, and return surely at your pleasure and whensoever you will, without

any hindrance being placed in your path, for any reason that may exist or which may hereafter arise."

The king trusted in this and appeared almost alone at Peronne, where Charles the Bold received him with respect (October 9). But with the duke the king saw his most bitter opponents—Philip of Bresse, whom he had held prisoner for three years; the Sieur de Neufchâtel, whom he had deprived of Epinal; the Sieur de Chateauneuf, for whose use he had with his own hand designed one of those iron cages which had long been used in Italy and Spain. Louis began to remember the bridge of Montereau, and, to be free from any sudden attack, asked to be lodged in the castle, a place of sad memories, where Herbert of Vermandois had held Charles the Simple prisoner. Louis's fears were well founded. The duke himself was not without some temptation to take advantage of the mistake which the king had made. But the conditions of peace were calmly discussed until, on October 10, news came that Liége had risen, that the bishop and all his chapter had been murdered with the Burgundian envoy Humbercourt, and that the leaders of the rebels were two French agents.

The news was greatly exaggerated, since neither the bishop nor Humbercourt were dead, and it was most unlikely that the revolt was the work of the king, who had no interest in killing the Bishop of Liége, which would have embroiled him with the Bourbons, but had rather interest in winning him over, and for this purpose had tried to secure for him the cardinal's hat. It may be remarked that a revolt of this city, so harshly treated by Charles the Bold, was a most natural thing; that the movement began on September 8, and that the interview took place on October 9; that the relations of Louis with the populace of Liége dated from the beginning of his reign; and that even if the news had been true, the terms of the safe-conduct still covered Louis XI.

Yet from the point of view of Charles the Bold, an event like this seemed to confound his passion with his interest, to legitimatise, at least in his own eyes, the disloyal act which he meditated. He fell into a violent passion, uttered the most terrible threats, and caused the gates of the castle to be closed. Louis was a prisoner; a great lord once taken, says Comines, cannot be freed; it may be added, that he could not be guarded but must be slain. But if Louis were killed, his brother would succeed, and that brother was then the friend, ally, and guest of the Duke of Brittany. It was doubtful if it was worth while to run

such a risk to give the crown to a prince devoted to the Breton interest. It seemed better to wrest from the king important concessions, to humiliate him, and by this means to ruin him in public opinion. The calculation was as faulty as the execution of the plan was defective.

"On the night of the thirteenth, the duke did not go to bed. He only lay down two or three times on his couch and then walked about, as his manner was when he was troubled. Morning found him more angry than ever, threatening and ready to do some great deed. Then he resolved that the king should swear peace and march with him to Liége to aid him in taking vengeance, and to help the bishop, who was the king's near relative; then the duke would be content. So he suddenly went to the king's chamber and bore him these words. A friend had warned the king, assuring him that no ill would befall him if he granted these two points, but that if he did otherwise, he would be in great peril, so great that none greater could ever come to him."

"When the duke reached the king's presence, his voice trembled, for he was deeply moved and ready to burst forth. He made humble obeisance, but his gestures and voice were stern, as he demanded of the king whether he would hold the treaty of peace which had been written and agreed, and if he would swear to it. The king answered, 'Yes.' As a matter of fact, the treaty made little or no change as far as the Duke of Burgundy was concerned from the treaty made before Paris; as far as the Duke of Normandy was concerned it made a great change, since the duke exchanged Normandy for Champagne and Brie and other neighbouring places. Then the duke demanded whether the king would go with him to Liége to aid in avenging the treason of the citizens which was due to him and his coming; the duke dwelt on the relationship between the king and the Bishop of Liége, who was of the Bourbon family. The king answered that as soon as the peace was sworn, which he greatly desired, he would be ready to go to Liége and to aid the duke with men, many or few as the duke saw fit. The duke was greatly pleased with these words, and forthwith produced the treaty of peace and brought from the king's chest the true cross, which St. Charlemagne had borne and which was called the cross of victory; the bells of the town were rung, and all rejoiced."

To hand over Champagne to his brother was to give it to Charles the Bold, who found this territory desirable for him as a means of communication between his possessions in Flanders and those in Burgundy. To march against Liége, where his flag

was flown, was an act of cowardice, but the princes of that period put success first and honour afterwards. Louis XI. followed the duke to the siege of the town and fought bravely. One day, in a moment of alarm, he assumed the command for a time. He led the assault, and when the people of Liége, seeing him, cried, "Vive la France!" he answered loudly, "Vive Bourgogne!" The city was taken (October 30), and when this shameful object had been attained, Louis sought the duke and said to him with an air of good humour that "if he had any further need of him he should not spare him, but that if he had nothing more for him to do, he was anxious to go to Paris to announce their agreement to the parliament, for, according to the custom of France, all agreements are published there, or otherwise they are void. He further asked the duke if he might come to Burgundy in the following summer and spend a month making good cheer; that was settled when they parted, and the king took leave of the duke, who conducted him for half a league on his way, and when they separated, the king said, 'If my brother who is Brittany happens not to be content with the share that I have granted him for love of you, what shall I do?' The duke answered hastily and without thought, 'If he will not take it, and you content him in some other way, I am satisfied as to you two.' This question and answer was to have great importance later on."

Louis gives his Brother Guienne instead of Champagne (1469).—"On Saturday, November 19, 1468, there was published in the quarters of Paris to the sound of trumpets and in public, the accord and union made between the king and the Duke of Burgundy, and it was announced that on account of the past no one should dare or be so bold as to attack in any way the said duke, whether by word of mouth or writing, by signs or pictures, verses or poems, defamatory libels, songs or acting, or in any other possible way. Those who were found doing so should be heavily punished in proportion to the seriousness of the offence. On the same day, by order of the king and in virtue of his commission, all the pies, jays, and owls in the city of Paris were taken, whether they were in cages or otherwise, and were brought to the king; the places where they had been found were enrolled in writing and also all the good words which these birds could say and which had been taught to them."

The word which these bold birds cried most and which they had best learned was Peronne, the scene of the king's defeat in

one of these trials of wit which he so much loved and where, taken in a trap, he had left his enemies nothing to do but to close the gate and dictate humiliating conditions for his release. Louis cared only to obliterate the memory of this unfortunate treaty.

Charles the Bold had said that it was enough that the king's brother should be content, and Louis took care that his brother should be thoroughly content. In place of the barren and impoverished Champagne he gave him the fair and fertile Guienne; in place of Troyes for a residence he gave him Bordeaux; and Charles of Berry readily accepted such an exchange which at one stroke divided him from the Burgundians and embroiled him with the English, the former masters of the district who still hoped to regain it.

The Cages of Iron: Cardinal La Balue and the Bishop of Verdun (1469).—One of the king's councillors had betrayed him during these negotiations, La Balue, a man of low origin, who had been made Bishop of Angers and Cardinal, and who had strongly advocated the interview of Peronne. Louis discovered that he was in secret correspondence with Burgundy. He was arrested with his accomplice, the Bishop of Verdun, and they were both shut up in two iron cages, where they remained forten years. Chabannes had served Louis better. He commanded the army which the king had assembled near Peronne, and after the treaty had been signed Louis instructed him to disband his troops. Chabannes took care not to do so and the nearness of this army had imposed some restraint on the duke. The king showed his appreciation of such a man. He sent him with his army against the Duke of Nemours and the Count of Armagnac. The first secured his pardon; the latter saved himself by flight, the king confiscating his goods. At the same time, the Duke of Brittany swore to renounce all foreign alliances by the Treaty of Angers and the king gave the Earl of Warwick, who had been reconciled with Margaret of Anjou, the means of overthrowing Edward IV., Charles the Bold's brother-in-law.

Assembly of Notables at Tours (1470).—The king, having once more isolated the Duke of Burgundy, dared to attack him openly. He assembled a meeting of notables at Tours in which there figured among the sixty members thirty-two magistrates and the presidents of the various courts of finance and justice in the kingdom. He explained to this meeting his complaints against the Duke of Burgundy, whom he accused of having attacked the ports of Normandy in time of peace; of having exacted from

his subjects, the vassals of the crown, an oath that they would serve the duke against all, not excepting the king ; and of having seized the goods of Frenchmen on the way to the fair of Antwerp. The notables answered that on these grounds the Treaty of Peronne had been broken by the duke, and that the king, as a result, might occupy the places on the frontier, St. Quenin, Roy, Montdidier, and Amiens. Louis mobilised an army of 100,000 men and the duke was powerless.

New Coalition against the King (1471).—But the Dukes of Brittany and Guienne and the Constable St. Pol, the chief of the army, were alarmed at the rapid progress of the king and had already betrayed him. In the previous year a dauphin had been born, and as Guienne was no longer heir to the throne, it was to his interest to revive the league of princes. Louis, seeing that his success was declining, realised that new plots were formed against him ; he thought it wise to halt and agreed to the Treaty of Amiens with Charles the Bold. This was the more necessary since at this very time Edward IV., the ally of Burgundy, regained the English throne (1471).

Death of the King's Brother (1473).—Louis XI. had thus once more to snap the thousand chains with which the aristocracy sought to shackle the crown. The court of his brother was no longer that of a young fool without money or soldiers, but that of the master of a rich and powerful domain, and it became the centre of all intrigues. A new and great feudal house had been established. The Duke of Burgundy offered the Duke of Guienne his only daughter, in the hope of one day adding to his possessions in Aquitaine states more extensive, more populous, and richer than those of the king himself. It is true that Charles at the same time offered his daughter to the son of the emperor on condition that he should be named King of the Romans. It is doubtful whether the duke himself knew which promise he intended to fulfil, but the king was alarmed at the mere prospect of such a union. His brother was the great obstacle that he found in his path, and he made one last attempt to attach the prince to the fortunes of his own house, offering him four more provinces, to extend his domain to the Loire, and to marry him to his own daughter. Charles of Guienne did not answer ; he made preparations for war, summoning all the forces of his duchy and nominating an enemy of the king, the Count of Armagnac, general of his forces.

The king saw the danger increasing and did not know how to avert it. He appealed to the Scots for help ; he asked the pope

to judge between him and his brother, he declared himself a canon of Notre-Dame de Cléry, he ordered prayers for peace, and instituted the custom of praying at midday, at which hour all the citizens of France were to fall on their knees and say three *Aves*. This institution was the origin of the Angelus. If a writer of the following age may be believed, Louis went himself to Notre-Dame and prayed, "Ah, my good lady, my little mistress, my great friend, in whom I always find all my comfort, I pray you supplicate God for me and be my advocate with Him, that He may pardon me the death of my brother whom I am causing the wicked Abbot of St. Jean to poison. I confess to you as to my good patroness and mistress; but what else could I do? He only troubles my realm. Seek my pardon, then, my good lady, and I know that it will be granted."

His brother actually died; his death was the only event which could free Louis XI. from the imminent peril in which he was placed. The contemporary accounts state that the Abbot of St. John d'Angely, almoner to the Duke of Guienne, had himself picked and peeled a peach which he presented to the lady of Montsoreau, who shared it with Charles of Guienne. Two months later the lady was dead; eight months later the duke was dead. The abbot was accused of the dual poisoning, was taken to Brittany, tried and imprisoned, but one morning, after a terrible storm, he was found dead in his prison; it was stated that the devil had strangled him. The documents of his trial were brought to Louis XI., suppressed by him, and the judges who showed so much complaisance were loaded with royal favours.

It is questionable whether the duke was poisoned, whether, if he were poisoned, Louis XI. was guilty. The problem is insoluble. But if the guilt of the king must remain dubious, the ferocious joy which he showed at the death of his brother cannot be doubted. It appears in the letter which he wrote to the Count of Dammartin while the Duke of Guienne was dying: "Grand master, since the last letters that I wrote you I have had news that the Duke of Guienne is dying and that there is no hope of recovery. This was made known to me by one of his intimates, who sent an express messenger; he added that it was believed my brother could not live more than a fortnight at most. That you may know this information is reliable, it came from the monk who said the hours to the Duke of Guienne. I have been greatly moved and signed myself with the sign of the cross from the head to the feet."

War with the Duke of Burgundy (1472).—This event destroyed

all the projects of the Duke of Burgundy. In his anger, he published a manifesto in which he accused the king of treason, *lèse-majesté*, and parricide. Louis, he said, had two years before tried to remove him by the dagger or poison; he had now caused his brother to perish pitiably by means of poison, maledictions, sorcery, and diabolical invocations. To avenge him, the Duke of Burgundy passed the Somme and entered the kingdom, swearing that he would put everything to fire and sword, though the truce made with Louis XI. had not yet expired. The war was of the character the duke had said. Appearing before the little town of Nesle, he entered it, declaring that the capitulation was broken, and ordering the slaughter of all the inhabitants. Men, women, and children had taken refuge in the great church, where they were massacred. The duke rode in, crossed himself, and said, "By St. George, my children, you have made a fair butchery." The streets ran six inches deep in blood.

Resistance of Beauvais : Joan Hachette.—Such a massacre was a warning to other towns to defend themselves strongly. Thus when the Burgundian army arrived before Beauvais (June 27, 1472), the burghers resisted a violent assault for eleven hours. The women took part in the defence, and one of them, called Joan, like the heroine of Domremy, snatched a Burgundian banner which had been planted on the rampart. The king, in recognition of this, instituted an annual procession in which the women passed before the men. Charles, who had hoped to take the place by a sudden attack, was not prepared for a siege. He attempted to hurry the matter and delivered a new assault which cost him 1500 men (July 9). A fortnight later, he raised the siege and turned towards Normandy, burning all the small places he could enter, such as Eu, St. Valery-en-Caux, Longueville, and Neufchâtel, while the French followed him closely, cutting off his supplies. Charles was checked before Dieppe, and fell back on Rouen, where, he said, he had arranged for the Duke of Brittany to join him. He halted under the walls for four days, and then, accusing Francis II. of having broken his promise, returned to his own lands.

New Treaty with the Duke of Brittany (1472).—If Francis II. had failed to keep his appointment it was because Louis XI. had attacked him vigorously, capturing La Guerche, Machecoul, Ancenis, and Chantocé. Then, having frightened the duke by his success, the king offered him a favourable peace. It was signed on October 18, and on October 22 Charles the Bold,

who had always been so intractable, himself accepted the Treaty of Senlis.

Comines enters the Service of Louis XI.—The Treaty of Peronne, which was believed to have overthrown the King of France, was torn up; the shame of Liége was compensated in the eyes of Louis XI. by the shame of Beauvais. It was felt that a king who had emerged with good fortune and skill from such a critical condition might do anything in the future with greater resources, and the wise felt that if a master had to be chosen, the best to choose was the King of France. Philip de Comines, the councillor of the Duke of Burgundy, and Odet d'Aydie, Sieur de Lescun, the two men most skilled in the understanding and practice of the art of politics, who loved the policy of ruses and success, both passed at this time into the service of Louis XI.

CHAPTER XXXV

THE REIGN OF LOUIS XI. (1472–1483)

The Duke of Burgundy and the Burgundian Possessions.—Philip de Comines and the Sieur de Lescun, the wise men of the period, were right, for they placed success before morality, and success was henceforth assured to the King of France. His most formidable adversary laboured from this time only to destroy himself.

Charles destroyed himself by pursuing an object the realisation of which was beyond his power. His states comprised the duchy and county of Burgundy in the basin of the Saône; the Low Countries at the mouths of the Scheldt, Meuse, and Rhine. One part was French, the other German; one feudal, the other communal. There was no communication between them, and to join them it was needful to hold either Champagne or Lorraine and Alsace. Charles had already tried to secure the former by causing it to be granted to the Duke of Guienne; he sought in turn to secure each of the other two. In the Flemish part of his dominions he had subjects hostile to each other; history attests the long rivalry between Holland and Belgium. The Burgundian state had neither frontiers, centre, national sovereign, nor common language, at a time when nations were becoming defined, when in all western Europe political unity was developing. Hence it could only be a fragile

dominion and, as it was altogether abnormal, of ephemeral duration.

One thing, however, might be supplied to the lands of Charles the Bold, a common frontier and physical barriers, if it were possible to secure the ancient Lotharingia, to acquire all the land from the Cevennes to the Alps, from the Rhine to the Scheldt. To gain this frontier was the aim of Charles; the difficulty of the task is obvious. He was compelled to resist successfully the power of France, Germany, Switzerland, Lorraine, and Provence, and when the frontier had been conquered, he would have had to weld together all these races—to cause to live together, as members of one family, the men of Marseilles and the men of Nimwegen; to seek for and find the central point of this long strip of territory, a centre which was in reality non-existent; to conquer the invincible communes of Flanders, the brave soldiers of Dauphiné, the Swiss mountaineers; to produce uniformity from the most profound divergences. The enterprise was foredoomed to failure, and its disastrous end was found under the walls of Nancy in 1477. But it was a great and serious undertaking, the details of which merit attention.

The first attempts at this impossible centralisation were made from 1468 to 1473. A treasurer-general for all the Burgundian lands was created (1468), a supreme court of justice founded at Malines, and a great military ordinance issued for the unity of the army.

Acquisitions in Gueldres, Lorraine, and Alsace (1469–1473).—But Charles the Bold concerned himself rather with conquests than with institutions. The old Duke Arnold of Gueldres having been imprisoned by his son Adolph, Charles made himself judge between father and son and decided for the father, who sold him the duchy (1469). The Duke of Lorraine died; Charles seized his heir, René de Vaudemont, and forced him to cede four strong places on his frontier with free passage through his domains (1473). In the same year, the Elector of Cologne, Robert of Bavaria, nominated Charles advocate and defender of the electorate. Sigismund, one of the perpetually necessitous Austrian archdukes, who was always in debt, had already mortgaged to him for a small sum the landgravate of Upper Alsace and the county of Ferrette. This was part of the district which formed the passage between Franche-Comté and Luxemburg, and from it Charles's agent, Hagenbach, menaced Berne, Basle, Mülhausen, Strasburg, the Rhine cities, and Switzerland (1469).

Charles Attempts to secure a Royal Coronation (1473).—Charles attempted to join a title to these acquisitions. He wished to secure public recognition of the real independence that he enjoyed and to exchange his ducal title for a royal one. He applied to the ancient dispenser of royal titles, the Roman Emperor, at that time Frederic III., a prince more concerned with the interests of his own family than with the empire. Charles the Bold offered him the hand of his daughter Mary (which had been already promised to several princes) for his son Maximilian, and with her the richest inheritance in Christendom; in exchange, Frederic was to raise the Burgundian possessions into a kingdom.

The matter was arranged, and an interview was fixed at Treves to settle the final details. But the Duke of Burgundy kept the emperor waiting; he appeared in such sumptuous state that the wretched following of the emperor seemed still more despicable. Neither of the two rulers wished to redeem his promise first. On the one hand, Charles had no real intention of giving himself a son-in-law who would embarrass him by his needs; on the other hand, Frederic feared to rouse resentment in the empire by increasing the already menacing power of the Duke of Burgundy. Disquieting news reached the emperor from Louis XI., and Frederic III. quited Treves, leaving word for Charles that their affair should be dealt with at a fitting time.

League against the Duke of Burgundy: Siege of Neuss (1474–1475).—At the same time the duke learned that a league had been formed by the Archduke Sigismund, the threatened Rhine towns, the Swiss, and the King of France. The archduke suddenly repaid the 100,000 florins agreed upon for the redemption of Alsace, which Charles was forced to give up. His agent, Hagenbach, whose tyrannical administration had pleased the duke, was seized and executed by the people of Brisach (1474). Along with this news, the duke received the solemn defiance of the Swiss who invaded Franche-Comté and had already defeated the Burgundians at the bloody Battle of Hericourt.

These events occurred at a time when Charles was already engaged on another war. He supported the Archbishop of Cologne, Robert of Bavaria, who had named him protector of his electorate, against the pope, the emperor, and his subjects, and laid siege to Neuss, near Cologne. Situated on a rock and well defended, Neuss resisted for eleven months, when the arrival of a large German army forced the duke to raise the siege. Charles

the Bold retired; he saw himself insulted and baffled. The Swiss had defied him; the Duke of Lorraine defied him; the King of France captured the towns of Picardy and invaded Artois; and the ally upon whom he had counted to occupy the attention of Louis signed a treaty of amity with France.

Expedition of Edward IV. to France (1475).—When he left for Germany, Charles pressed Edward IV. to invade France. The war suited the ideas of the English king who wished to rally round him all the parties by which his state was troubled, and who, with the help of the Duke of Burgundy and of the Constable St. Pol, hoped to wage a brief and glorious campaign. He landed at Calais at the head of a magnificent army, believing that he would find the duke there with all his forces. Charles met him almost alone to tell him that he was attacking on the side of Lorraine, but that the constable would open the fortresses, the gates of France, to him; he then went away. On this assurance the English king advanced towards the Somme and approached St. Quentin. The constable opened fire on him. Edward was already very angry with those who had called for his help and received him in this way; the skill of the French king did the rest. Louis first bought the herald who bore the defiance to him with 300 crowns, twenty yards of silk, and fair promises if he secured peace; then he bought some of the English barons, and finally the king himself.

He had to pay dear. Edward was to receive 75,000 crowns for the cost of the war and 50,000 crowns annual pension; his daughter was to marry the dauphin (August 29, 1475). The English army itself was entertained at open table in Amiens. "He had placed at the entrance of the city gate two tables, one on each side, filled with all good things that any one could wish to eat, the best wines procurable, and supplied with men to serve them. There was no thought of water. At each table five or six men of good family were seated; they were fat and lusty, the better to please those who wished to drink. When the English came near, they saw them seated; men seized their bridles and cried that they would break a lance with them. They were brought to the tables and made to sit down in great good humour, and they took the jest well. While they were in the city they paid nothing where they lodged, they were furnished with all things necessary where they ate and drank, they demanded what they would and paid nothing, and this went on for three or four days."

This was not heroic, but it was very profitable. Louis was con-

tent and allowed the people to give the treaty its true name, the merchant's peace.

Charles the Bold conquers Lorraine (1475) and invades Switzerland.—Edward having signed the peace, Charles the Bold was forced to come to terms, and concluded with Louis the Treaty of Soleure (September 13) in order to be free to finish his affairs in Lorraine and Switzerland. He thought that he would be able to deal with France later. Louis prudently cleared the wild boar's way. Though he had urged René to war he left him to fall. Charles the Bold entered Nancy (November 30), and less than two months later passed the Jura to subdue Switzerland, the Swiss having overrun Franche-Comté, burning and pillaging. The free peasants believed themselves to be the finest soldiers in the world, and so they were. Charles the Bold despised the "Alpine cowherds," attacked them in mid-winter with an army of 18,000 men, which had already made two fatiguing campaigns, and besieged the small town of Grandson (February 18, 1476). The place held out for ten days. To induce the defenders to submit, Charles promised them their lives: when he had taken the town he caused them to be hanged or drowned.

Battles of Granson and Morat (1476).—All Switzerland rose at the news of this treachery. The confederate army from Schwyz, Berne, Soleure, and Fribourg attacked the Burgundian troops while they were entangled in a narrow plain, where neither their artillery nor their cavalry had free play. The Swiss infantry, armed with eighteen-feet lances, did well against foes so embarrassed. Charles ordered a movement to the rear in order to deprive the enemy of this advantage of situation. His men were filled with panic, which was increased by the unexpected arrival of the contingents from Uri, Unterwald, and Lucerne. All the duke's efforts failed to stay a terrible rout. The loss was small; Comines says that only seven men-at-arms fell. But prestige had vanished; Charles of Burgundy was no longer Charles the Invincible. He had been beaten; he had fled. His sword, tent, diamonds, and ducal seal, his collar of the Golden Fleece and the furniture of his chapel, fell into the hands of the Swiss, and the laugh was with the rustics.

Having retreated to Lausanne, the duke had only one thought, that of vengeance. He summoned soldiers from all sides to form a new army, 4000 Italians, 3000 English, Savoyards, men from Franche-Comté, Burgundy, and Flanders, in all 30,000 soldiers. He left Lausanne (May 27) saying, "I will breakfast at Morat, dine at Fribourg, and sup at Berne." He arrived before Morat,

which repulsed ten assaults in ten days (June 22). Meanwhile the cantons assembled their forces and foreign help reached them. Louis sent no soldiers, but he sent money; troops arrived from Alsace and from Germany, despite the emperor, and René de Vaudemont, the young Duke of Lorraine, despoiled by the Duke of Burgundy, gave the Swiss the only thing they lacked, a few cavalry and some steel armour.

The Swiss army left Berne on June 21, 1476. Charles the Bold, amply warned, took no precautions; his artillery and cavalry were so placed that they could not act. The Swiss had reached his lines while he still refused to believe that they would dare to attack. They fell on the Burgundians with their habitual impetuosity, carried his batteries, enclosed the ducal army between their main body, the garrison of Morat, and the lake. They made a terrible butchery, 8000 or 10,000 men falling, besides those who were drowned.

Battle of Nancy: Death of the Duke of Burgundy (1477).—The great Duke of Burgundy, vanquished and a fugitive, assembled the States of Franche-Comté, Burgundy, and Flanders, to receive only humiliating refusals on all sides, to hear bitter and insulting speeches. All his enemies profited from his disaster, and he had to contend at once with the Swiss, with Louis XI., and with René. The attack of the last, coming from his weakest foe, affected him most. Lorraine was the bond between his various territories, the natural centre of the Burgundian empire, and it is said that he designed Nancy as the capital of his new kingdom. He hastened to save the place, but arrived before its walls three days after it had fallen (October 22). But the town had neither a garrison nor food, and keeping it closely blockaded, Charles hoped soon to re-enter it.

His enemies showed an activity equal to his obstinacy. Louis XI. and René hired mercenaries from the Germans and Swiss and the Duke of Lorraine appeared in sight of Nancy with 2000 men (January 4, 1477). Charles the Bold had only 4000 soldiers, but no remonstrance could move him to retire. "If it must be, I will fight alone," he said. On Sunday, January 5, he moved against the enemy through deep snow expecting rather to perish than to conquer. In a few minutes the little Burgundian army was dispersed, taken, or slain. The duke himself was killed by an unknown enemy and his mutilated body was found next day by one of his pages.

On January 7, Louis XI. had already learned this important news. "When the king received the letters, he sent to the city of

Tours to seek out all the captains and many other great personages and showed them the news. All gave signs of great joy, but it seemed to such as watched closely that this joy was somewhat forced, and that despite their actions they would have been glad if it had gone otherwise with the duke. The reason was perhaps that the king was already feared, and they expected that when he found himself freed from his enemies he would wish to change many things especially in the matter of lands and offices. For in that company were many who, in the matter of the Public Good and in other affairs of the Duke of Guienne, had found themselves in opposition to the king. After having talked a little to these men, Louis heard mass and caused a table to be set in his chamber where he made them all dine with him; his chancellor and others of his council were there and he spoke always of these matters. And it may be guessed with what appetite they dined; it is the truth that, whether for joy or for sorrow, none ate half his portion."

Humbling of the Nobles.—As soon as Louis had seen Charles the Bold attack the Germans, he realised, as was said, that he had only to let him alone; that the duke would be so injured or embarrassed that he would no longer be a formidable adversary. Louis accordingly seized this respite to reckon with those who had so often opposed him.

Ruin of the House of Alençon (1474).—In 1458 the Duke of Alençon, accused of having treated with the English, had been condemned to death and Charles VII. had commuted the sentence to imprisonment for life. At his accession, Louis XI., anxious to undo what his father had done, had opened the gates of his prison, and Alençon profited from his liberty to cause the murder of those who had borne witness against him. He made false money, joined the League of the Public Good and all the plots formed against the king; he even offered to sell to the Duke of Burgundy his duchy of Alençon and his county of Perche. In 1473 Louis caused him to be arrested and handed over to parliament, taking the precaution of distributing his property among his judges. His life was spared, but he was kept in prison till his death two years later.

He left a son, René, to whom the king paid a modest pension very irregularly. René was content, as he was in great fear of the king and because he would have been content with anything if he were left his pleasures and his hunting. But those to whom his property had been distributed always feared some inconvenient claim on his part. They wrote him anonymous letters:

The first told him that the king would make him a monk ; René was alarmed, having no vocation. The second stated that the king was about to imprison and try him, which meant condemn him ; the third, that the king had appointed agents to kill him. The count was forced to implore the protection of the Duke of Brittany and of the King of England. At once Louis was informed that the Count of Perche was preparing to fly to the enemies of the realm. To pass to England or Brittany was to Louis an unpardonable crime. René was arrested and shut up in an iron cage a foot and a half long, being fed by a fork through the bars (1481). He was kept there for twelve weeks, but written proof was wanting. One of his neighbours inspired him with confidence and went to him hastily one night saying, " By God's body, you are a dead man if you do not take care." He added that his brother had learned from a sure source that René was to be put to death and urged him to avail himself of the king's absence. The prisoner, in his terror, begged the man to supply him with the means of escape ; this he promised to do, but urged that it was needful first to write to the Duke of Brittany to demand protection from him. He gave the captive the means of sending this message ; the count wrote and his enemies secured the needed piece of evidence. The accused was condemned to beg pardon from the king and to imprisonment for life.

Ruin of the House of Armagnac (1473).—Louis had serious charges to bring against the Count of Armagnac, that dreadful John V. who had married his own sister, forced his chaplain to bless his incestuous union by threatening to throw him into the river if he made any difficulty, and drew his dagger on any who remonstrated with him. Tried before the parliament for incest, murder, and forgery, he was condemned under Charles VII., but escaped, and one of the first acts of Louis XI. had been to restore him his lands, with full pardon for all his crimes. Armagnac made the return which might have been expected. He was constantly among the enemies of the king, allied with the Duke of Burgundy, the Duke of Guienne, and the King of England. Louis XI. took the first opportunity of punishing him (1473), and employed for this purpose the Cardinal d'Alby, on whom he could count. The prelate besieged Lectoure with an army ; the town was defended and proposals for a capitulation were made to the count. While the negotiations were in progress and at the moment when the surrender was being signed, the cardinal carried a gate of the

town and then the town itself. John of Armagnac was stabbed before the eyes of his wife; the soldiers ranged through the houses, pillaged everything, murdered every one, and fired the houses, so that of the population only three men and four women survived. The wife of the count, who was with child, was poisoned.

Ruin of the House of Nemours (1477).—The house of Armagnac had a younger branch, the house of Nemours. In 1477, James of Armagnac, Duke of Nemours and Count of La Marche, being arrested, imprisoned, placed on trial, and condemned, wrote the following letter to Louis XI.: "Most dread and sovereign lord, as humbly as I can, I commend myself to your grace and mercy. I have done so many wrongs towards you and towards God that I see well I am lost if your grace and mercy be not extended to me, which, very humbly and in great grief and contrition of heart, I ask you and pray you freely to pardon me in honour of the blessed passion of Our Lord Jesus Christ, for the merits of the blessed Virgin Mary, and for the great mercy which she has shown to you. If this one sacrifice has redeemed the world I present it to you for my deliverance, poor sinner that I am, and for my entire absolution. Do not permit that for my sins I die in shame and confusion and that my poor children live in dishonour, seeking their bread. If you have love for my wife, your cousin, have pity on her wretched husband and her orphans. Sire, do not permit any judges of my cause other than your mercy, clemency, and pity. Sire, in honour of the blessed passion of the Redeemer, as humbly as I may, I beg pardon, grace, and pity. I will serve you so well and loyally that you shall see I am truly repentant and that as far as I can I wish to make amends for my wrong-doing. For God's sake, sire, have pity on me and my poor children. Extend your pity to them and they will never cease to serve you and pray to God for you. Whom I pray, of His goodness, to grant you a long and happy life, with the fulfilment of all your good desires. Written in a cage in the Bastille the last day of January, 1477. Your very humble and most obedient servant and subject, the poor James."

This letter was very touching, and the man who was not touched by such heartrending supplications must be pitied, though it may be added that the guilt of the criminal is not removed by repentance and prayers.

The Nemours family owed everything to Louis XI. With that unwise preference which he showed for some persons, he had

given to James of Armagnac, with the title of Duke of Nemours, vast possessions in the dioceses of Meaux, Châlons, Langres, and Sens. The king forced the judges to decide in favour of the duke in a shameful case. The League of the Public Good was formed and Nemours joined the rebels; at the Treaty of Conflans he returned to the king, swore fealty to him on the relics of the Sainte Chapelle, received from him the government of Paris and of the Ile de France, and less than a year later was again in the ranks of his enemies. In 1470, having seen his cousin of Armagnac condemned, he became alarmed, made a new submission, and took a new oath, the most solemn possible. His promise was vain. In 1475, in the midst of Louis' extreme embarrassment, the duke remained in his own lands awaiting the turn of events, and meanwhile, refusing all help to the king, he tried to seize Languedoc. Freed from the English, Louis besieged and took Nemours in his castle of Carlat, transported him to the Bastille, and placed him in chains in an iron cage. He ordered that he was only to be let out of it to be tortured, and that he was to be tortured severely that he might speak openly. He learned that some leniency was being shown the prisoner and at once wrote, "M. de Saint Pierre, I am ill content with that which you have told me, how he has had the irons on his limbs loosed and been allowed to go into another room to be dealt with. Take care that he does not again leave his cage, that he does not go outside unless it is to be tortured, and that he is tortured in his cell, and I ask you, if you have ever sought to do me service, that you make him speak." Judges to whom the king, according to his custom, had already distributed the goods of the accused, received the charge and began the trial. When he saw that condemnation was inevitable, Louis carried the case to the parliament that the sentence might be more solemn. Nemours avowed everything and wrote his suppliant letter to the king. This letter Louis merely added to the evidence, but it made some impression on the judges and three members of the parliament voted in favour of the accused. Louis suspended them from their office. The parliament complained in writing of this violence done to conscience. The king answered angrily, "Seeing that you are subjects of the French crown and owe loyalty to it, I thought you would not have approved action so contrary to my will. After reading your letters, I know well that there are still some plotters against my person among you, and that they may save themselves from punishment they wish to abolish the death penalty. It is therefore well that I should remedy

two things: first of all, to purge the court of such men and next to enforce the observance of the statute that I have made, that nothing may be allowed to excuse the crime of treason." Condemnation was pronounced and the duke was beheaded in the market. The story that his children were placed under the scaffold to be bathed in his blood is a modern invention, unknown even to the most hostile contemporaries.

Submission of the Southern Barons and Acquisition of Roussillon.—A brother of John V. of Armagnac and a member of the powerful house of Albret, guilty of plotting, were respectively imprisoned and beheaded, and these executions filled the southern barons, so often in rebellion, with respect for the law and the king. The King of Aragon had mortgaged for 200,000 crowns the district of Roussillon, and fomented a revolt in it, hoping to regain the province and keep the money. Louis sent a large army there, took Perpignan after a memorable siege, and closed this gate into France (1474).

Ruin of the House of St. Pol (1475).—There still remained one noble to punish in the north, a noble who, like Nemours, owed everything to Louis XI., who had given him money, domains, the command of Rouen, the government of Normandy, and the sword of France, with the title of Constable. The Count of St. Pol, who held both French and Flemish fiefs, resolved to create between England, France, and Burgundy an independent state; he worked for ten years for this object, deceiving in turn the English, French, and Burgundians. He especially deceived Louis XI., who despite all his finesse was easily hoodwinked. Louis became the most implacable of his foes when the event which St. Pol had not foreseen occurred, and the rulers of England, France, and Burgundy exchanged the letters which he had written to them and learned that they had each been duped in turn. At the approach of the French troops the constable believed that, in spite of everything, there remained a refuge for him with the Duke of Burgundy, the friend of his youth. He fled to Mons. The king wrote that he might return without fear. "I have great difficulties and have need of a head such as yours," he wrote, adding to those who were present, for fear that he might be thought a liar, "it is the head that I want; his body may remain where it is." St. Pol took care not to come; he thought that he was safer where he was, but he was wrong. The Duke of Burgundy and the king made an exchange; the former was allowed to work his will on René of Lorraine and the latter received the constable, who was removed to the Bastille,

questioned on things which he could not deny as they were written down, and executed on the Place du Grève with extreme promptitude by order of the king's men, some of whom saw that they might be compromised by the revelations by which St. Pol proposed to earn his pardon. The king often showed his regret that the constable had not been tortured in order to wring further confessions from him.

Extension of Royal Power.—These were the chief executions ordered by Louis XI. If the means employed and the barbarous procedure of the Middle Ages be forgotten, there is perhaps not one of these condemnations, with the exception of that of the Count of Perche, which would not have been pronounced at the present day. The existence of France depended on the realisation of two objects, unity of territory and unity of government. This dual unity, vaguely understood, was the aim of all Louis's acts. The object of his reign was the recovery of the fiefs and of the powers of the barons for the crown; he pursued this end or prepared the way for its attainment by every means, attacking in turn all the great families, either attaching them to himself or ruining them. He dealt with the families of Alençon, Armagnac, Nemours, St. Pol, and Albret by rigorous or bloody executions; with the house of Bourbon by threatening the trial of the aged Duke John and causing that prince's heir, Peter of Beaujeu, to enter his own family. He secured the house of Orleans by marrying his second daughter, Jeanne, to Duke Louis; the house of Anjou, by wresting from the old René and his nephew Charles a will which made him heir of Maine, Anjou, and Provence. As for the house of Brittany, the last and most vigorous of the great fiefs, he secured Angers, Le Mans, and Alençon, invited all Bretons to come to him who would accept his offers and who might one day serve him. Peter de Rohan became a marshal of France; Guy de Laval was made governor of Melun; Peter de Laval was made Archbishop of Reims. All these measures hastened the destruction or at least the humbling of that princely aristocracy, which had lately been so formidable to the crown, and which ceased to be dangerous as soon as its chief support, the redoubtable Duke of Burgundy, had fallen.

The Burgundian Succession: The House of Austria in the Low Countries.—The death of Charles the Bold opened a serious question for France. He left an only daughter, and the problem of the Burgundian succession arose. Louis XI. attempted to acquire it by marriage, but the same attempt was made by others. Five prospective husbands offered themselves; two

Englishmen, the Duke of Clarence and Lord Rivers, brother and brother-in-law of Edward IV.; two Germans, Adolph, Duke of Gueldres, who had been imprisoned for parricide, and Maximilian, Archduke of Austria, son of the Emperor Frederic III.; and one Frenchman, the Dauphin Charles, afterwards Charles VIII. The English claimants were soon dismissed, as the Flemings would not agree to a marriage which would have handed over their industry, their most cherished possession, to England. The French alliance was equally impossible, as it would have been the union of a child of eight to a princess of twenty, while the Flemings would never have accepted a count who was also King of France, and thus too powerful for them. Louis XI. realised this and sought to secure his gains beforehand. In the case of Picardy he put forward the right of recovery by the crown, stipulated in the Treaty of Arras; in Artois, he put forward the right of confiscation for the injuries which the Duke of Burgundy had done him. In Burgundy he alleged the right of wardship; he was eager to act as guardian for his good relative and daughter, whom he proposed, he said, though he had certainly given up the idea, to marry to his son, the dauphin. On all these grounds he seized and confiscated and arranged to hold what he had taken. Thus he declared Our Lady the Countess of Boulogne, and received the town to hold in fief for her, doing her homage and swearing to defend her well. He increased the privileges of the town of Arras, an important barrier of the kingdom, and after having regained the French provinces, invaded the imperial and Flemish lands, in Franche-Comté, Hainault, and Brabant.

That he might not be disturbed in these conquests, Louis took care to stir up trouble in Flanders. The Flemings, ill-treated by Charles the Bold, saw in his death a veritable deliverance. The duke had left only a daughter of twenty, a fortunate circumstance for the Flemings; they would marry this princess at their pleasure and would first make her promise that she would rule only by the advice of the States of Flanders. She promised and at the same time wrote to Louis XI. that her two advisers would be Burgundians, the Chancellor Hugonet and the Sieur d'Humbercourt, servants of her father. Louis then did a disgraceful thing: he showed this letter to the deputies of Ghent, when the people, enraged against the two councillors, put them to death. The young countess never forgave Louis the humiliation which he had caused her to suffer, and despite the King of France, despite her own subjects, who wished to marry her to Adolph of Gueldres, the brigand whom they had released from

prison, she gave herself and her rich heritage to Maximilian of Austria, one of numerous princes to whom her father had promised her. The marriage was concluded on April 27, 1477. Oliver the Devil, Louis's barber, who was sent to Ghent with a pompous embassy and with the title of Count of Meulan to oppose the match, failed to prevent it.

In modern times, royal marriages are merely family events, often unnoticed in history, since they rarely exercise any influence on the fate of nations. It was different at the close of the Middle Ages, when the bride had as dower a city, a province, or a people; when states were made and unmade solely on account of the unions of their rulers. Among these princely marriages, that of Maximilian of Austria to Mary of Burgundy is of vital importance in history owing to its consequences. The son of this union, Philip the Handsome, married the heiress of Castille and Aragon; the Castillian, Aragonese, Burgundian, and Austrian possessions were united in a single hand, and there arose the monstrous power of Charles V. and the struggle of France and Europe against the house of Austria.

Battle of Guinegate (1479).—That struggle, as it originated under Louis XI., had not the importance it acquired later. With the help of a subtle distinction which he produced between taking and occupying, Louis entered into Hainault, took or occupied Cambrai, Bouchain, Le Quesnoy, Avesnes, and Thérouanne. At the assault on Quesnoy, he saw young Raoul de Lannoy in the thick of the enemy. The king was brave, whatever was said about him, and loved bravery in others. He caused Lannoy to come to him, hung a chain of gold worth 500 crowns round his neck, and said, "By the Sacrament, my friend, you are too rash in battle. You must be chained up, for I do not wish to lose you, wishing you to serve me more than once." But the Flemings were angry at these encroachments, and determined to retake this last town. Crèvecœur, the general of Louis XI., came to the relief of Thérouanne, and descending a hillock met Maximilian, who had arrived with the Flemish militia, 27,000 men and 850 lances. Crèvecœur had half as many infantry and twice as many men-at-arms. With his mass of cavalry he charged, pursued Maximilian's men-at-arms, and forgot his own infantry on the battlefield. The free archers, left alone, were roughly handled. The French garrison of Thérouanne made a sortie to take the enemy in the rear, but unfortunately came to the enemy's camp on their way and waited to pillage it.

When Crèvecœur returned from the pursuit, he found that all was lost and that only flight remained to him. Maximilian gained nothing but the honour of holding the field, being unable even to retake Thérouanne. He retired to Flanders where he found himself involved in a host of difficulties. At Ghent the people had risen in revolt against a surtax of some liards (a quarter of a sou) on small beer; in Gueldres there was a rising of the province which wished to regain its independence and to have as ruler a descendant of one of its old dukes; in Holland there were the bloody factions of the *hameçons* and *morues*.[1] Maximilian used up his last resources in escaping from these difficulties, he pledged his wife's jewels, and fell ill of despair.

Treaty of Arras (1482): The King retains Half the Burgundian Inheritance.—These last years were very profitable to the King of France. Good news and inheritances came to him one after another. In 1480 René died, in 1481 his nephew Charles, and thus in virtue of the wills which they had made Maine, Anjou, and Provence passed to Louis XI. On March 27, 1482, Mary of Burgundy died. She sustained a severe internal injury by a fall from her horse, and died rather than tell the doctors. She left two children, Philip and Margaret, but the Flemings nominated a council of regency and did not leave Maximilian even the shadow of authority. As a German prince, he utterly failed to appreciate liberty and tried to act as he had done in Austria, seizing and hanging some recalcitrant burghers, and thus ruining his credit. The Flemings turned to the King of France and offered their little Princess Margaret to the dauphin, with the French provinces of the Burgundian house as her dower. Louis only counted on the towns of Picardy and the duchy of Burgundy. The Flemings of their own accord added what did not really belong to them, the county of Burgundy and the county of Artois. On such terms, the Treaty of Arras was concluded with ease (December 23, 1482).

This King of France, who was talked of by all, who negotiated everywhere, intrigued, inflicted severe punishments in his realm, bought at great expense lions from Africa, mules from Sicily, reindeer from Sweden, horses from England, and dogs from Spain, as though he had been a tireless hunter—the Flemish envoys found this king in the heart of his château of Plessis les Tours, which was less a château than a fortress and a prison, with iron gratings, iron doors, bridges, towers, and soldiers. When they had passed drawbridges and bastions, they found themselves in the

[1] Opprobrious epithets; literally *fish-hooks* and *codfish*.

evening in a little, ill-lighted chamber; in the corner of this chamber they saw a man almost entirely hidden under rich furs. This was Louis XI., for the last two years struck down by paralysis, knowing that he was dying and yet filling all Europe with his activity, becoming more distrustful and severe as he felt himself growing weaker, holding with all his might to the remnants of life and to his power. Speaking with difficulty, he told the envoys that he was unable to rise or to uncover himself; then he caused the Gospel to be brought to him that he might swear. They would excuse him, he said, if he swore touching the book with his left hand; his right hand was somewhat feeble. He was already well-nigh dead. Then, suddenly reflecting that a treaty sworn on the left hand might well be one day annulled on this ground, he made an effort and touched the Gospel with his right elbow.

Acquisitions made During this Reign.—Whether with his left hand or his right elbow, this moribund king received four rich provinces, Picardy, Artois, the county of Boulogne, and the duchy and county of Burgundy, with Charolais and Auxerre. A will had given him three other provinces, Maine, Anjou, and Provence. By legal process he secured the duchy of Alençon and Perche; by the death of his brother he secured Guienne; by his intervention in the affairs of Spain he secured Roussillon and Cerdagne. Eleven provinces were thus added to the royal demesne in a single reign, in addition to the profit made by the execution of St. Pol, Nemours, and Armagnac. A great step had been taken towards unity of territory and a decisive blow struck at the power of the nobles. The great men had been spared neither in their persons nor in their lands, their rights had been no more respected than their persons. The aristocracy was vanquished, the monarchy exalted, while to avoid new difficulties for the crown, Louis only employed small men who could be easily plunged back again into their original obscurity.

Foreign Affairs: Relations with England and Aragon.—The numerous activities of the king at home, important as they were, did not entirely prevent action abroad. France began to regain the premier position which she had held more than once. Her alliance was sought everywhere; Castille, Venice, and Scotland gloried in it, Bohemia and Hungary desired it. Louis XI. was named burgher of the Swiss cantons and their first ally. Six thousand Swiss served in his armies; Scots formed his guard. He was the protector of Lorenzo di Medici at Florence, supporting him even against the pope; of Galeazzo Sforza at

Milan; of the young King of Navarre, the young Dukes of Savoy and Gueldres. He had the wisdom to use these alliances only in so far as they helped him, and he refused to engage in the adventurous policy which they suggested. The Genoese offered him the lordship of their town; it would have been a useless and dangerous possession beyond the Alps. "The Genoese have given themselves to me; I give them to the devil." But if he would make no risky conquests, he strongly desired such as were necessary. The King of Aragon had mortgaged Roussillon and Cerdagne to him in 1462 and was very anxious to regain them; Louis successfully defeated such attempts and took all measures to secure one of the natural frontiers of France.

Germany under Frederic III. did not cause France any uneasiness. Louis was afraid of England, though he was prepared by the Treaty of Arras to break off the marriage which had been arranged at the Treaty of Pecquigny between the dauphin and a daughter of Edward IV. Louis saw that the English king would soon be carried off by his excesses and he was right.

Last Days of Louis XI. (1483.)—But at the age of sixty years the King of France was also dying, and he made a thousand efforts to retain his life. He implored the King of Naples to send him "the most holy man, Francis de Paul, before whom he fell on his knees that he might be pleased to prolong his life." The Sultan Bajazet sent him relics found at Constantinople, asking in return only that Louis would guard strictly his brother Zizim, the Duke of Guienne of the Ottoman Empire. The king had the sacred ampulla brought from Reims and proposed to be anointed from head to foot. The people circulated reports that Louis made terrible and marvellous medicines; that to rejuvenate himself, he drank the blood of children. Remedies, prayers, and the will to live were useless. Nothing was of any avail; he had to go the way of all flesh, says Comines. Those around him, whom he had always ordered to break to him gently the news of approaching danger, told him brusquely that he must die. At last he resigned himself to fate, sent for his son, the dauphin, gave him the usual excellent advice, and expired on August 24, 1483.

New Parliaments: Postes: Favour shown to the Burghers.—Louis granted permanency of office to magistrates (1467), a curious grant from such a ruler. He extended the activity of the government in distant provinces by establishing *postes* (1464), which for a century served only the needs of the king and the

pope; by creating the parliaments of Grenoble, Bordeaux, and Dijon, and by establishing an appeal to the royal courts from manorial courts. To secure the affection of new provinces and to preserve that of the old, he maintained or created provincial states. During his reign, the three orders assembled in Champagne, Dauphiné, Périgord, Guienne, Normandy, Languedoc, and Provence, and the king heard their complaints. To gain the burghers, and to find in their devotion support against the nobles, he allowed them to buy the right which the nobles had had of commanding the watch, and thus destroyed feudal influence in the towns. He often authorised assemblies of burghers, free election of magistrates, and the grant of noble rank to the holders of certain municipal offices.

Encouragement of Commerce, Printing, and Literature: Comines.—Louis XI. did not prefer municipal to aristocratic independence. He would allow neither. If he beat down the great fiefs, if he executed St. Pol and Nemours, the burghers who rose against the increased taxation were cruelly treated. Many perished, being hanged to the trees along the roads or thrown into the river, sewn in sacks on which was written, "Let the justice of the king proceed!" Everything bent before his sovereign will; he left the monarchy covered with blood but feared by the nobles for its strength and respected by the people because it guaranteed public peace, the safety of the roads, and was already interested in the great concerns of modern states, commerce and industry. One day when he heard that his troops had pillaged he wrote at once to Dammartin, "I pray you, that you do not allow pillage another time, for you must be as good an officer of the crown as I am, and if I am king you are grand master."

"One merit," says Comines, "our good master had. He put nothing into the treasury; he took all and spent all. He made great buildings for the fortification and defence of the towns and places of his kingdom and did more than any of the kings before him."

He improved the public roads and gathered round him the ablest merchants to advise as to means of increasing the prosperity of commerce and industry. He multiplied fairs and markets; granted privileges to peasants who engaged in foreign trade, and allowed nobles and ecclesiastics to engage in this work on condition that they used French ships. He attracted the merchants of the Low Countries to French fairs by abolishing for them tolls and river dues, and by similar inducements drew

to Lyons the traders of Savoy and neighbouring lands, who had previously only frequented the market of Geneva.

Craftsmen from Venice, Genoa, and Florence founded the first silk manufactories at Tours, and Louis also encouraged one of the oldest French industries, that of mining.

"To avoid fraud and trickery," says Comines, "he established unity of laws, weights, and measures in the kingdom and ordered that all the customs should be written down in a fair book." This great work was not a mere compilation but a work of legislation, since Louis caused laws of foreign lands, especially those of Venice and Florence, to be studied and collected, and he doubtless borrowed much from the admirable civil government of the great Italian republics.

It must also be noted of this prince that he had literary tastes, that he encouraged learned men, founding or reorganising the universities of Valence, Bourges, and Besançon and many schools of law and medicine. He received with favour Gutenberg's new invention of printing. Villon flourished under Louis XI.; his councillor, Comines, is one of the great French historians. Louis did not love the disputes of the schools. Weary of the quarrels of the scholastic philosophers, he caused their writings to be chained up in the libraries and made the professors swear that they would no longer teach the nominalist doctrines. This singular interdict was withdrawn seven years later (1481).

Character of Louis XI.—Louis XI. contributed more than any other king to found the French monarchy, and is in some respects the representative of the new spirit in politics. By giving nothing to birth and all to merit he prepared for intellect the position which it holds in modern society, though intellect with Louis XI. was too often merely ruse and perfidy. He attempted to make public interest prevail over private interests, but he gave to the severe measures which the welfare of France required the appearance of personal vengeance. Where he was concerned only with territorial unity he seemed to be satisfying his royal greed; where he was concerned only with unity of administration he seemed to be actuated by the hateful jealousy of a despot amusing himself. He had to destroy a feudal society, already undermined though still tenacious of its position, and bound either to give way or to perish. It resisted, fought, and perished; but the fight was so waged that pity was on the side of the vanquished and that the rights of the conqueror were forgotten, the right of the crown to establish peace and order in the realm. Louis XI. fulfilled his duty in this regard; but too often he bent

the moral rule which should never vary. He must be judged by a higher standard of morality than that of Comines, who appreciated all his master's acts, saying, "God will pardon a prince who knows good and evil as did the king our master." Another historian, Duclos, says, "Louis XI. was equally renowned for his vices and his virtues and when the two are balanced he was a king." France certainly owes him much, though she may be unable to agree with all the means which he used to attain an admirable end.

CHAPTER XXXVI

THE REIGN OF CHARLES VIII. FROM 1483 TO 1491

The Royal Family : Charles VIII.: Anne of Beaujeu: Jeanne of France.—Charles VIII., aged thirteen years and two months, was the youngest child of the late king. "Of short build, with a large head, a thick neck, large and protruding breast and shoulders, long and thin thighs and legs"—such is the unflattering portrait of him left by his contemporaries. His moral character was in some respects even worse than his physical appearance. His father had composed or caused to be written under his supervision a book of policy for him, the *Rosier des guerres*. He was little attracted by the sickly child, who was also of feeble intellect, and kept him at Amboise far from the court, consoling himself for being unable to make him study by reflecting that the prince would at least understand enough to know that "he who cannot dissimulate cannot reign." If he did understand the saying he ignored it, but it is doubtful if he was able to read the words. This sad prince was King of France, in possession of absolute power because he had entered his fourteenth year and the majority of the king was fixed by law at thirteen years.

This legal fiction was not abused. It was well known that all authority, apparently entrusted to a child, was really in the hands of his sister, Anne of France, who had married Peter of Beaujeu, of the house of Bourbon. This lord, a younger member of a great family, gave little support to a princess of twenty-two, who had on her side neither her father's will, nor her brother's affection, nor the laws of the kingdom, nor the advantages of experience, but only the merit of uniting in her person many of the qualities of Louis XI., who had said of her, when he entrusted her with the care of the young king's education and

health, "She is the least foolish woman in the world, for none of them are wise."

The third child of Louis XI., Jeanne of France, was three years younger than her sister, small, thin, dark, hunchbacked, so unprepossessing that her father could not bear to see her. When she did appear before him, she always used to hide behind her governess. Married in 1476 to Louis of Orleans she had not found in this union, which was only the pledge of a political reconciliation, more happiness than she had found in her own family, and she was destined to have more evidence of the nature of her marriage.

The Duke of Orleans and the Duke of Bourbon.—Her husband, Louis of Orleans, was twenty-one years of age; he was much occupied with gallantry, fêtes, and tournaments; he could jump fifteen feet ditches and would tame fierce horses in the palace court. In his view these were royal occupations and qualities. Alexander had begun his reign in that way. In conjunction with his position as first prince of the blood they would assure him the supreme power in the state. But being a man of pleasure rather than of intrigue he was content to be regarded as a model knight, but for his two young cousins, the Counts of Angoulême and Dunois, who urged him forward that they might possess themselves of power. The old Duke of Bourbon had similar pretensions, but he, the elder brother of the Sieur de Beaujeu, had been confined to his bed by gout for eight years and was easily satisfied with a share. The essential thing was that the aristocratic principle should be revived as in the time of the kings of the past, that the days of the princes and nobles might return.

Aristocratic Reaction.—Princes and nobles set to work without delay. Orleans granted himself a pension of 24,000 livres, a company of 100 lances, and the lieutenancy general of the Ile de France, Picardy, and Champagne. Count Dunois was to receive a pension of 4000 ducats and the government of Dauphiné; the Count of Angoulême 20,000 livres and a company of ordnance; the Duke of Lorraine 36,000 livres, 100 lances, and the duchy of Bar, while his claims to the inheritance of Provence and Anjou were being examined; the Duke of Bourbon was to receive the titles of constable and lieutenant-general of the kingdom with the salaries and advantages attached to these functions. Finally the king was to be disarmed by sending away the 6000 Swiss whom Louis had had in his pay. Vengeance and greed were alike satisfied. An ordinance attacked all whom

Louis XI. had treated well, by revoking all alienations of the demesne which he had made. One by one the late king's "evil councillors" were to be taken and punished. Oliver the Devil and Daniel his worthy assistant were hanged and their goods confiscated for the benefit of Orleans. John Doyat, having been scourged, had his tongue pierced and his ears cut off; the doctor, Coictier, was exiled after restoring 50,000 crowns. If the friends of Louis XI. were ill-treated his old enemies fared well. The Count of Perche was freed and became Duke of Alençon; Poncet de Rivière, one of those who had stirred up Charles the Bold at Peronne, was made mayor of Bordeaux; the goods of the Prince of Orange were restored; and Philip of Savoy, Count of Bresse, returned to court to take rank with the princes of the blood. The reaction did not cease here. Those whom Louis XI. had caused to be executed, John of Armagnac, who had been guilty of incest and murder; James of Nemours, ten times traitor to state and king, were converted into innocent victims, and the brother of the one, the children of the other, claimed justice, rehabilitation, and most of all restitution. That the counter-revolution might be complete, that as little as possible of the work of Louis XI. might survive him, it was essential that the whole government should pass into the hands of the princes. But that aristocracy had been so hardly used in the previous period that it lacked the courage to put forward great claims. The question of sovereign power, which it should have decided for its own interest in its own favour, was committed for decision to the States-General, summoned to meet at Tours on January 4, 1484. Orleans had not the least fear that the States would assist him to replace his sister-in-law; Anne on her side was sure that they would enable her to curb all this young ambition.

States-General of 1484.—These states were really the first national assembly in France. All the districts of the north and south sent deputies; each order named its own, even the peasants, who were then called for the first time to exercise in the primary assemblies their political rights. As a result the states of 1484 mark the appearance of the rural population in public life, as those of 1302 had marked the appearance of the urban population, or rather, the end of the fifteenth century marks the definitive union of the burghers and the peasants, the formation of the third estate. In the body of the assembly the deputies, instead of being divided and voting by orders, separated into six bodies, corresponding to the six great territorial divisions,

and thus foreshadowed the future union of the orders which occurred three centuries later. No assembly, unless perhaps that which Marcel directed, had so boldly proclaimed national rights.

On January 15 the royal sitting took place in the great hall of the archbishop's palace, which was divided into two sections. In the first, which was four feet higher than the second, was the young king's throne; on his right hand was seated at some distance the constable and on his left the chancellor. Between them and the throne were Count Dunois, the Sieur d'Albret, the Count of Foix, and the Prince of Orange. Further back were seated two cardinals, six ecclesiastical peers, and six princes of the blood or lay peers; twenty lords were behind them. On the lower floor the deputies of the nation were ranged on semicircular benches. On the first were the bishops, barons, and knights; on the second the other deputies. The chancellor, William de Rochefort, pronounced a long and confused oration, in which he cited at haphazard Juvenal, Caesar, St. Jerome, Pythagoras, Plato, Persius, Augustus, Boethius, Cicero, Clothaire, St. Louis, Solomon, Sallust, Horace, David, and Scipio Africanus. What the chancellor wished to say in the midst of this deluge of learning was that the king wished to know his people and to be known by them; that economy of expenses was to be introduced, that reforms had been initiated and were to be carried through, that the king could provide for his personal expenses from the revenues of his demesnes, and that it was necessary to appeal to the States for the revenue which the security of the kingdom required. When they had satisfied this demand the king, whom the chancellor called a second Solomon, the father of his country, and the founder of peace, whose remarkable beauty they were called upon to admire, would hear with kindness the complaints and remonstrances of his people. He would repress all abuses and prepare the happiness of his realm, taking justice as his guide in all his acts; making those royal virtues, gravity, majesty, temperance, continence, and forethought, his constant companions, while there would not be wanting to him constancy, truth, patience, knowledge, purity of conscience, and the sacred college of other virtues.

Next day the States formed their six committees or nations of France, Burgundy, Normandy, Aquitaine, Languedoc, and Provence. They chose as president the Abbot of St. Denis, the first deputy of Paris, and set to work to draw up their lists of grievances. This work was finished early in February and discussion began.

An important question was raised, that of the wardship and education of the king. Some deputies urged that the national assembly had no right to concern itself with the tutelage of the king or the regency, that by the essence of monarchical power these duties devolved on the royal family, and that if the king could not exercise his functions personally they fell by right to the princes of the blood. This view found an eloquent opponent in Philip Pot, Lord of La Roche, deputy of the nobles of Burgundy, who made a speech of remarkable boldness. "To whom will you give the tutelage of the young king? To his nearest relative? But then you will have reason to fear that he will free himself of his ward to reign himself. Is it suggested that the regency of the kingdom should be given to the nearest relative and the guardianship of the king's person to the next relative? This affords no better guarantee than the previous suggestion and there is no law authorising such a division of authority. Is it suggested, as some say, that all the princes of the blood have the right to share in the regency? The princes of the blood are innumerable if all the descendants, male and female, are considered; they are numerous even if only the males are considered; how would so many individuals agree, and if they failed to agree what recourse have they but to arms? And recourse to arms is just what it is desired to avoid. It can be avoided only by recognising a sovereign power, in which authority resides, which cannot be divided; that authority rests with the people or in the States-General composed of their representatives. As history relates, and as I have learned from my fathers, in the beginning the sovereign people created kings by election and gave preference to such as were pre-eminent for virtue and ability. Each people chose a king for its own advantage. The princes truly are princes, not to make profit from the people or to grow rich at their expense, but, forgetting their own interest, to enrich the people and to lead them to welfare. If they have sometimes done otherwise they are tyrants and evil shepherds who have eaten their sheep themselves, adopting the manners and name of wolves rather than the manners and name of shepherds. It is of extreme importance to the people what law and what chief directs it, for if the king is good the people will be good and if the king is evil the people will be evil. Have we not often read that the state is a republic, the property of the people? Shall the people then neglect to care for it? Why do flatterers say that the prince's sovereignty does not derive from the people? Is it because among the Romans all

the magistrates were not elected? Is it not true that every law, before enforcement, should be approved by the people? In many lands the king is still elected according to the ancient practice."

The States were, then, according to this orator, the depositaries of supreme power; nothing could be done without their advice and consent; it was pointed out that this power had been exercised under Philip IV. and his sons, at the accession of Philip of Valois, and under the regency of Charles V. The discussion was interrupted by a royal séance in which John de Rely, canon and deputy of Paris, addressed a long harangue to the king, which affords a singular picture of contemporary eloquence, half being in Latin, half in French, the text intermingled with quotations. After this the lists of grievances were read for three hours, at the end of which the canon found that the king was sound asleep, and the sitting was adjourned for two days.

Organisation of the New Government.—In the interval between the two sittings, the deputies tried to agree on the nomination of the members of the council, but they reached futile decisions, leaving all to the king, with a mere recommendation that the council should include twelve deputies from the States. In the absence of the king, Orleans presided over this council; in his absence, the Duke of Bourbon, then the Sieur de Beaujeu. Anne of Beaujeu was not named in this act; on the contrary, the Duke of Orleans was nominal head of the government and believed himself to be its real head. But Anne had taught her brother to fear and obey her, by making him preside at the council. She removed Orleans, while by making her husband preside she also removed the Duke of Alençon, the Count of Angoulême, and the other princes of the blood who were unwilling to sit below a simple baron. Thus a form of government was constituted which no one had foreseen, that of "Madame la Grande," as she was called, by which the firm and energetic rule of Louis XI. was continued.

Situation of the Kingdom according to the Cahiers of the States.—In addition to the chapter dealing with the council, the *cahiers* of the States contained five other chapters, dealing with the Church, the nobles, the third estate, justice, and commerce, which indicate the condition of the kingdom at the time. The *cahier* of the Church contained only two important demands, that the king should be crowned without delay and that he should restore the liberties of the Church as defined by the Councils of Constance and Basle and which the Pragmatic Sanction of

Bourges had guaranteed to France. The *cahier* of the nobles demanded indemnities for military service and the right of hunting in the demesnes which Louis XI. had taken away. The *cahier* of the third estate set out the extreme misery to which the people had been reduced by the intolerable burden of taxation, by the exactions of the court of Rome, which caused, it was said, all money to flow into Italy. Also by the exactions of the soldiery, who travelled incessantly from province to province and were billeted on the labourers, and that "after they had paid the the tax entitling them to be defended and not pillaged by the army; the soldiers were not content with what they found in the cottages, but forced the cottagers with blows to go and find wine for them in the town, white bread, fish, and spices. The inhabitants of many villages, whose cattle had been seized, were themselves yoked to the waggons; others, that their beasts might not be seized, dared only work in the fields at night." The deputies of Anjou, Maine, and the surrounding district stated that in their provinces more than 500 persons had been put to death in two years only on the ground that they had smuggled salt. As a remedy for these evils, the States demanded that the pensions granted to lords should be suppressed or greatly reduced; that the king should cut down the number of his men-at-arms to the number that Charles VII. had maintained and oblige them to observe the ordinances; "that taxes should not be imposed or exacted without prior authorisation by the three estates and without their cause and the needs of the king and kingdom being stated." In the chapter on justice, the States demanded the suppression of the sale of judicial offices, the abolition of judicial commissions and provost judges, the fixing of the cost of justice at a moderate price, and, finally, that all useful reforms might be effected and that good order might be maintained. The representatives of the nation demanded that the lord king should declare and approve that the States should meet two years after the present meeting, and in future every two years. In the chapter on commerce, the States demanded the moderation of tolls, the good preservation of bridges and roads, which should be made safe.

Dissolution of the Assembly.—An important question, the amount of taxation, remained to be settled. Before deciding it, the States demanded to know all the revenues, but were able only to secure falsified accounts; they eventually granted for two years the same tax that had been paid to Charles VII., allowance being made for the depreciation of the coinage. The discussion

then degenerated into shameful quarrels between the provinces, each trying to escape some part of the common burden. A discussion as to the payment due to the deputies increased the discredit of the States; the third estate voted that each estate should pay its own deputies, which the nobles and clergy refused, though they at last gave way at the instance of the chancellor. The assembly was dissolved on March 15, 1484, when the king's answers to the demands in the *cahiers* were published; they were almost uniformly favourable. But as no ordinance resulted, after so much discussion, no reform was effected in the government.

First Revolt of the Duke of Orleans (1485–1488).—The Duke of Orleans was a great figure at the fêtes and tournaments which were held to celebrate the coronation of Charles. The duke's fine appearance, knightly manners, and taste for dissipation and pleasure made a deep impression on the mind of the young king, over whom he gained a degree of influence which disquieted Anne of Beaujeu. She also heard of the prince's secret plans against her power, and dealt with the difficulty in a manner worthy of a daughter of Louis XI. She suddenly sent a force of soldiers into Paris with orders to seize the Duke of Orleans, who was then in the market playing tennis with Count Dunois and some others. They had only time to jump on the first horses they could find and fly at full speed. Orleans, declared a rebel, attracted to his side the Duke of Brittany, Francis II., and allied with Maximilian, who regretted the concessions made in the Treaty of Arras, and even asked help from Richard III. of England. Anne of Beaujeu brought all these plans to nothing. She kept Richard III. in his own kingdom by giving help in men and money to his rival, Henry of Richmond, who soon became King Henry VII. She treated with the states of Flanders against Maximilian, whose opponents acted in the name of their young prince, Philip of Austria; and she allied with the nobles of Brittany against Landais, the hated minister of Francis II. Landais was seized and hanged. La Trémoille besieged Orleans in Beaugency, took him and forced him to return to court with a promise that he would occupy himself with his pleasures for the future. To keep him better in check, Anne removed Dunois, whom she exiled to Italy.

The Fool's War: Battle of St. Aubin du Cormier (1486–1488).—But Maximilian, who had some months before been nominated King of the Romans and was heir to the imperial crown, broke the Treaty of Arras. The league of princes revived, a true

League of the Public Good. Anne had not made the mistakes of Louis XI., she had greater resources and used them ably. While d'Esquerdes checked Maximilian in Artois (1487) and there took St. Omer and Thérouanne, Anne put herself at the head of a small army, devoted to the young king, who was delighted to see himself in fair armour on horseback, and advanced against the confederates of the south. Everywhere the burghers armed themselves against the lords and against their garrisons; in a few days, the needs of the south had been satisfied. Anne returned to attack Brittany, which La Trémoille invaded with the French troops (April, 1488), taking Chateaubriand, Ancenis, and Fougères, and meeting the Breton army near St. Aubin du Cormier (July 27). The Bretons spent part of the morning in confessing and receiving the communion; then they drew themselves up before a village, covering one of their wings with their waggons while the other rested on a forest. Marshal de Rieux commanded the advance-guard; the Sieur d'Albret the main body; a Chateaubriand the rear-guard; while the Duke of Orleans and the Prince of Orange were on foot among the infantry. La Trémoille had a powerful force of artillery; he fired at this strong position in order to effect a breach. A German captain, finding himself in a very exposed position, withdrew his men a little to one side in order to avoid the fire and left a gap in the line of battle. The French gendarmerie at once hurled themselves into this opening and cut through the opposing force. At the same time, some Italian *condottieri* in the service of France turned the Breton flank and cut down their infantry from the rear. The Breton cavalry, who were on the wings, fled after a short resistance; the infantry fought better, but were severely handled, three or four thousand being left on the field of battle, while the prisoners also were numerous. The Duke of Orleans was captured in the wood as he tried to rally the fugitives; the Prince of Orange was recognised as he tried to hide among the dead, and the arrest of these two important personages completed the ruin of their party.

According to a tragic but somewhat doubtful story, Louis de la Trémoille, returning to his lodging after the battle, invited to his table the Duke of Orleans, whom he placed beside him, the Prince of Orange, who also sat beside him, and some captive knights. At the end of the meal he caused two Franciscans to enter the hall. Terror seized the guests, who realised only too well the reason for the presence of the confessors. La Trémoille rose and said, "Princes, my power does not extend over you, and if you

were subject to it, I would not exercise it ; I send you to the king to be judged. But you, knights, who, as far as you could, have given occasion for this war by breaking your faith and being false to your vows of chivalry, shall pay to-day with your heads for your crime of treason. If you have any burden on your consciences, see, here are monks to take your confession." Then he caused them to be taken into the courtyard and put to death, out of hand. The Duke of Orleans and the Prince of Orange were taken to France under close guard and imprisoned. The duke, heir-presumptive to the throne though he was, was kept for three years in the great tower of Bourges.

Things went equally well in the north. The Flemings, who had risen against Maximilian, expelled his German troops from their land and forced him to sign a new convention on the basis of the Treaty of Arras of 1482. Thus Anne of Beaujeu defeated all the coalitions and preserved her father's gains. She went further and added a large province to them. La Trémoille summoned Rennes to open its gates. The burghers answered that the king had no rights over them and that there were 20,000 men in the city to answer the attackers. Instead of putting them to the test, La Trémoille turned towards Dinan, which capitulated on terms, and to St. Malo, where the garrison shamefully surrendered. But negotiations were on foot, and on August 20, 1488, the Treaty of Sablé was signed. The Duke of Brittany engaged to send back all foreigners who had made war on the king, and no longer to receive his enemies ; the duke promised that he would not marry his daughters without the advice and consent of the king, who, on his side, agreed to treat them as dear relatives. The states of the province bound themselves with 200,000 gold crowns to observe these promises, while the French occupied as guarantees the four towns, St. Malo, Fougères, Dinan, and St. Aubin du Cormier.

Marriage of Charles VIII. with Anne of Brittany : Acquisition of that Province (1491).—Three weeks after the Treaty of Sablé, Francis II. died. The marriage of his daughter, Anne (the other daughter dying shortly afterwards), became a question of European importance. Was or was not Brittany, the last of the great fiefs, to be reunited to the domains of the King of France ? The sovereigns of Europe took the most lively interest in the independence of the province. Henry VII. promised troops and money ; Ferdinand of Aragon sent them. The aspirants to the hand of the duchess were numerous ; the Viscount de Rohan demanded her for his son ; the Sieur d'Albret, despite his age,

his common appearance, and his twelve children, sought her for himself; and the great "marrier" of richly dowered princesses, the Emperor Maximilian, to whom marriage had already given the rich provinces of Flanders, came in person to take the hand of the young princess, on whom his title made a great impression. France was threatened on all sides. But Maximilian, to hide the mysteries of his policy from the vulgar, went to Innsbruck while his ambassador in Brittany contracted the marriage by proxy. The King of France was more active and more fortunate. Anne of Beaujeu had worked skilfully on her brother's mind to make him desire this union with ardour. To mount on horseback, lance in hand, that he might conquer a rich province and a fair princess, was, to the young king, an imitation of the paladins, the heroes of romance whose deeds he was constantly studying. His troops already occupied a large part of the province; they undertook the siege of Rennes in the first days of August, 1491. At the beginning of October the king himself approached, coming to Baugé and then to Laval, and when the secret negotiations, which only became known from their result, reached their conclusion, he made a pilgrimage his excuse for proceeding to Notre Dame near Rennes. His devotions over, he entered the town with an escort of 100 men and fifty archers of his guard, he saluted the duchess and had a long conversation with her. Three days later they met in a chapel, where, in the presence of Orleans, Dunois, the Chancellor of Brittany, and others, they were affianced. The marriage took place in Touraine at the château of Langeais (December 6, 1491). The king was twenty-one, the duchess fourteen. They mutually ceded all their titles and claims to the duchy of Brittany, with the reservation, however, that if the duchess survived the king and had no children by him she would not proceed to another marriage save with the next king, if he could make the marriage; if not, with some near presumptive heir to the crown. This marriage was the last act of Anne of Beaujeu, *Madame la Grande*, as she was justly called. She had the rare merit of allowing power to pass gradually from her hands that it might go to those to whom it belonged without disturbance. After having ruled the kingdom vigorously for eight years, she returned simply and without effort to the duties of a wife and retired into privacy. She died in 1522. The marriage of Charles VIII. with the Duchess Anne brought under royal authority the last refuge of princely independence. Brittany was reduced to the position of Burgundy and Anjou; the last

and most obstinate of the independent provinces was included, like the rest, in the realm of France. The princes could no longer raise a banner against the king; the last war that they had waged was called by contemporaries "the Fools' War," and such attempts in the future were even more foolish.

Was the aristocracy vanquished for ever, finally curbed under the royal sceptre? Did this aristocratic reaction which appeared as soon as Louis XI. was dead have no result? What manner of persons surrounded Charles VIII.? They were the Duke of Orleans, Count Dunois; rebels, vanquished, captives set at liberty, restored to favour, honoured, and consulted. The aristocracy had been conquered and partially despoiled, but they had something left to them which attracted the crown, their spirit, their tastes, their aristocratic tendencies. The monarchy left the bourgeois and popular habits which it had affected more than once and which had served it so well under Philip IV., Charles V., Charles VII., and Louis XI. The crown took the sword and lance of the knights; it became warlike and conquering in imitation of the paladins of Charlemagne and the true chevaliers; even under Charles VIII. himself, it went to the conquest of the kingdom of Naples and dreamed of conquering Constantinople and Jerusalem.

NINTH PERIOD—THE ITALIAN WARS

(1494–1515)

CHAPTER XXXVII

THE FIRST ITALIAN WAR (1494–1498)

Italy in the Second Half of the Fifteenth Century.—At the time when the French monarchy absorbed the last of the great fiefs, the Italian peninsula still contained examples of every form of government; in the south, a monarchy; in the centre, a theocracy; and in the north, republics and principalities. In this land of a rich and corrupt civilisation, artistic marvels ill-concealed a premature decay, nor did literary brilliance hide moral decline. War was waged only by the arms of the *condottieri* who displayed skill in a form of tactics which involved many skirmishes and small slaughter, and who earned their pay with as little exertion as possible. Military virtue was extinct, a sign of a condition of affairs fatal to any people. To live well, it is needful to be able to die well, and Italy trembled at the sight of the sword. Honour was given to trickery, perfidy, deceit. Poison and the dagger decided all questions which in other days would have been decided by arms. Italian diplomacy was a school of crime.

The holy see and the states of the Church had fallen into the hands of Alexander VI., a Borgia, who dishonoured the chair of St. Peter by his abominable vices. At Naples Ferdinand earned the hatred of the nobles whom he robbed and of the masses whom he starved. At Florence Pietro di Medici did not know how to dissemble the authority which he exercised over the republic—an art in which his illustrious predecessors, Lorenzo and Cosimo, had been past-masters. In the duchy of Milan, Ludovico the Moor, brother of the late duke who had been murdered, devoted all his energy to finding a way in which he might usurp the power rightfully belonging to his nephew, Galeazzo Sforza, whose guardian he was, and he did not shrink even from the thought of crime. Venice, *la Dominante*, seemed to be at the zenith of her power; Genoa was in a state of perpetual revolution. The

glorious democracies of the previous century had been converted into oligarchies so narrow that in all the republics which existed in 1493 there were no more than 18,000 citizens enjoying political rights. From one end of the peninsula to the other despotism had taken the place of the former liberty and the peoples desired change without having the courage to effect their own salvation, to make themselves worthy of a better fate. Italy, fabulously wealthy and in a state of anarchy, was a prey ready for the first who dared to seize it. Charles VIII. proposed to be first in the field.

Unwise Concessions of Charles VIII. to Neighbouring States (1493).—Louis XI., who had given the Genoese to the devil, or, what came to the same thing, to the Duke of Milan, had carefully refrained from prosecuting the claims of the house of Anjou to the throne of Naples. Charles VIII. rescued those claims from oblivion that he might deliver some shrewd sword thrusts beyond the Alps. Anne of Beaujeu vainly offered counsels of prudence: "You will pay dearly by a long repentance." All the older politicians said the same, and Crèvecœur indicated that the Low Countries supplied the true direction for French expansion. "The greatness of the kingdom depends on the conquest of those lands." He was right, but the king refused to hear him; he desired something new, a brilliant and world-stirring expedition, after the manner of the paladins of Charlemagne, whose mythical exploits he persistently studied. He cared nothing for a war among the bogs of Flanders, where so many French kings had fought already. The red-hot ardour of the nobles, whose activities had been confined to their own land for thirty years and who wished to exert themselves abroad, carried all before it. Italy herself seemed ready to fall into the arms of France. Ludovico, threatened by the King of Naples, called in Charles VIII. Many others did likewise: the Marquis of Saluzzo, who wished his fief to depend on Dauphiné that he might be free from homage to his neighbour, the Duke of Savoy; the Neapolitan barons, exasperated against their king; Savonarola and the cardinals hostile to Alexander VI. "Noble spirits!" cried the poet Sannazar. "What madness led you, my beloved Italy, to pour out Latin blood for the sake of barbarians?"

As regards the situation of France, the time was not well suited for a distant expedition. The neighbouring powers, displeased at the acquisition of Brittany, formed a new league against France. Henry VII., the first of the Tudors, landed an English

army at Calais ; Maximilian, who had been so quickly supplanted by Charles, attacked Artois ; Ferdinand the Catholic, King of Spain, promised to cross the Pyrenees. These facts pointed to opportunities or necessities for war near home, but Charles, eager to set out, preferred to treat. By the Treaty of Étaples (November 3, 1492) the greedy Henry VII. re-embarked, carrying with him a promise of 745,000 gold crowns payable in fifteen years ; by the Treaty of Narbonne (January 19, 1493) Ferdinand the Catholic received Roussillon and Cerdagne without repayment of the money originally lent and despite the protests of Perpignan which wished to remain French ; by the Treaty of Senlis (May 23, 1493) Maximilian regained Franche-Comté and Charolais, the conquests of Louis XI., for his son Artois. All these districts were French, essential for the defence of the realm. Charles cared nothing for this ; the submission of Italy was certain and the conquest of Italy was to be merely the prelude to greater achievements. From Naples he would pass to Greece, expel the Turks from Constantinople, and, like the great knights of the Middle Ages, regain the tomb of Jesus Christ and bring it under the rule of a Christian kingdom of Jerusalem. With such rashness was France plunged into those hazardous expeditions which prevented those internal reforms and gains of territory which offered at her very doors. For a worthy successor to Louis XI., France had to wait for Henry IV. and Richelieu.

Conquest and Loss of the Kingdom of Naples: Battle of Fornovo (1494–1495).—A fine army soon assembled (August, 1494) at the foot of the Alps, so eager were the French to enter that land of wonder which was to be their grave. Charles had 3600 lances, 6000 Breton archers, 6000 crossbowmen, 8000 Gascon infantry, 8000 Swiss pikemen ; in all, a force of 50,000 men, with 140 great cannon and a number of small pieces, " a gallant company, but ill-disciplined." Bayard served as a squire. Much that was needed for so great an undertaking was lacking ; no provisions had been prepared, no tents, no coined money. Heaven would provide. " The journey," says Comines, " was undertaken rather with an idea of going than of returning ; its leaders took no thought for the future."

The King of Naples had posted his brother with a fleet at Genoa and his son with an army in the Apennines, the former to prevent attack by sea, the latter attack by land. The Duke of Orleans gathered some ships at Marseilles and defeated the Neapolitans at Rapallo ; the Neapolitan army dared only await

the arrival of the French advance-guard under d'Aubigny. It was known that the Duke of Orleans had killed every one of his opponents at Rapallo; this was no *condottieri* war, in which the worst that could befall was to be unhorsed and put to ransom, but an *evil war*, without mercy, without quarter. Terror filled all Italy; the barbarian invasions were recalled, but now it was too late to send back the foreigner who had been summoned.

Charles VIII. crossed Monte Ginevra on September 2. He found himself in need of money at the very outset of the campaign. Having danced and played at ball with the Duchess of Savoy and the Marquis of Montferrat at Turin, he borrowed their diamonds in order to continue his march. At Genoa he borrowed 100,000 francs at 42 per cent. At Asti he was ill for some time and was joined by Ludovico the Moor; he then visited Galeazzo at Pavia, "where the duke was kept as a prisoner in his castle. But they spoke only of general matters as Charles was anxious not to offend Ludovico. The Moor, son of the great Francesco Sforza, was a very cunning man, but cowardly and deceitful when he was afraid and without faith if he saw his interest in breaking his word." At the moment he was in terror of the Neapolitans; he led the conqueror across the duchy of Milan to the frontier of Tuscany. Soon after this his nephew died and it was believed that Ludovico had purchased leave to poison him and take his place. The fortresses of Sarzano and Pietra Santa might have checked the French; Pietro di Medici opened them in the hope of being maintained in Florence, which a Dominican monk, Savonarola, had raised against him. Pietro was only the more quickly expelled by the people on his return; but the tribune monk, who regarded Charles VIII. as the scourge of God upon Italy, went to meet the young king and led him into the city. Charles entered Florence as a conqueror, his head high, his lance at rest, and wished to levy a contribution on the city. When his demand was refused he threatened. "Blow your trumpets," retorted Capponi, the standard-bearer, boldly, to end the attempted exactions of this conqueror who had not fought, "and we will ring our bells."

At Rome the cardinals and the barons, ill-treated by Alexander VI., opened the gates to the French as to liberators and urged the king to depose an incestuous and simoniacal pope. Alexander had taken refuge in the castle of St. Angelo. Charles trained his cannon on the fortress, secured Caesar Borgia, the pope's son, as a hostage for his father's good faith, and a Turkish prince, Djem

or Zizim, brother of the Sultan Bajazet, who might be useful in forwarding the ultimate plans of the French in the East. A few days later Caesar escaped, while Djem, who had been poisoned before he had been handed over, died.

Charles now approached the object of his expedition, the kingdom of Naples. The frontiers collapsed of themselves. Ferdinand I. died, and his son Alfonso abdicated in terror. His successor, Ferdinand II., had more courage and wished to fight; at San Germano he found himself exposed to treason on two sides, in his army and in his capital, and was forced to fly to the Isle of Ischia, whence he reached Sicily. No further defence was offered. The servants of the army marked the houses their masters were to inhabit in Naples; Charles VIII. and his men entered the city (February 22, 1495), while flowers were rained on them from the balconies. This enthusiasm, like all popular whims, was of short duration. "Never did king or nation meet with such love from any people," said the French. The report of this rapid conquest crossed the sea and the Greeks began to arm in expectation of the coming of their deliverer, "the great King of the Franks."

The victors, however, cared only to celebrate their easy conquest. Charles caused himself to be crowned King of Naples, Emperor of the East, and King of Jerusalem. He appeared before the people with a mantle of purple over his shoulder, a globe of gold in his hand, and "celebrated the occasion by tournaments and pastimes." His companions divided the fiefs between them and married wealthy heiresses at the expense of the nobles of the country. But two months later the future conqueror of Constantinople and Jerusalem received a letter from Philip de Comines, then his envoy to the Venetian republic. A formidable league of European sovereigns had been concluded against France with the aim of closing the retreat of Charles from Italy and reducing France to her original limits. Ferdinand the Catholic, Maximilian, and Henry VII. were the leaders of the league; even the Italians who had called in the French or who had promised them fealty, such as Ludovico and Alexander and Venice, joined the alliance. The states of the peninsula gathered 40,000 men in the Po valley, while the other allies attacked the French frontiers. The Duke of Orleans was already hard pressed at Novara. The jealousy of Europe for France appeared for the first time, and there was need for haste. Charles left 4000 men with Gilbert de Montpensier, whom he named Regent of Naples, and with the rest took the road of the Apennines. He

had great difficulty in passing this chain through a narrow defile; the Swiss were loaded with cannon and even the nobles carried munitions of war. On the other side of the mountains, in the valley of the Taro, the confederate army, 30,000 strong, barred the route of the French, less than 10,000 in number. Charles none the less resolved to force a passage. While his advance-guard pushed along the Taro, he was attacked in the rear; he turned on the attacking force, and in an hour 3500 of them were killed, while the rest were dispersed. The Italians attributed the easy success of the French to the *furia francese* rather than to their own cowardice. The victory of Fornovo, however, merely served to open a way of retreat to the French (July 6, 1495).

Once in France, Charles seemed to forget Italy. Gilbert de Montpensier, Viceroy of Naples, a brave knight but one who never rose before midday, was not the man to supply in himself the help which he did not receive from others. Ferdinand II., arriving from Sicily with some Spanish troops, surprised Naples the day after the Battle of Fornovo and shut up Montpensier in Atella, where he died of plague. D'Aubigny brought back the remains of the French army; the dominion of France over Naples had fallen as rapidly as it had risen, amidst the same evidence of joy on the part of the people. No more traces remained of the expedition of Charles VIII. than of the deeds of Amadis de Gaul.

Death of Charles VIII. (1498).—Warned by experience and by the complaints of his people, the young king, says Comines, "turned his mind to living according to the commandments of God, to setting justice and the Church in good order, and so to arranging the finances that he should levy no more than 1,200,000 francs from the people as a *taille*, beyond his demesne revenues, on which he wished to live as the kings had anciently done. He was well able to do this, for the demesne was very great; including the *gabelles* and certain *aides*, it was over a million francs. He wished to confine a bishop to his see if he were not a cardinal and to allow no other plurality than these two offices; to keep the clergy to their benefices, but he would have found it hard to win the clergy to this. He held public audiences, where he received every one, to keep his people in fear and especially his officials." At the beginning of 1498 he was at the château of Amboise where he undertook great works, on which excellent workmen whom he had brought from Naples were employed. One day, passing along a dark passage, he hit his

forehead against a low door so violently that he died a few hours later (April 7, 1498). He was only twenty-eight. Comines says of him : " He was little learned, but so good that it was impossible to find a better creature." The direct line of the Valois became extinct with him, and was replaced by the branch of Valois-Orleans.

CHAPTER XXXVIII

LOUIS XII. (1498–1515)

Louis XII.—Charles VIII. leaving no son, the crown passed by right to the Duke of Orleans, then thirty-six years old, the grandson of a brother of Charles VI. Louis belonged to a delightful family, he was romantic and lively, pleasing both in his qualities and in his defects. His grandfather had been a brilliant knight; his father a poet who left some charming pieces; his uncle, Dunois, was one of the bravest captains of Charles VII. and one of the names of the old France which has remained in the mind of the people. Louis, without particular capacities, was distinguished by great good nature. He began his reign by reducing the *taille* and refusing the gift of the *joyous accession*, valued at 300,000 livres. Once the leader of the nobles against the crown, he bore no grudge against the faithful servants of Anne of Beaujeu, who had beaten him so thoroughly at St. Aubin. He received La Trémoille and the rest, telling them that it was not for the King of France to revenge the injuries of the Duke of Orleans.

He was at once concerned in an important affair. Anne, widow of Charles VIII., retired to the château of Nantes in her duchy of Brittany which by a second marriage she might bring to some foreigner. Louis, who had been married for twenty-two years to a daughter of Louis XI., for whom he had no love, demanded, despite the tears of this princess, that a divorce should be pronounced ; Alexander VI. had need of the king and granted his request, and Louis at once married his predecessor's widow. Brittany was again united to France, this time for ever (1499).

It was a time for foreign conquest. The ease which had attended the first Italian expedition, and the stories of that fair land, revived the taste for distant adventure. Louis XII., heir of the rights of Charles VIII. in Naples, had further, through his grandmother, Valentina Visconti, pretensions to Milan which the Sforza had usurped. He gave way to the passion of his age,

but he did not act with the rashness of his predecessor. If it were necessary to return to Naples and to occupy the extreme end of the peninsula, he was wise enough first to seize some strong position in the north. Naples had been fatal to the French because it was too distant; Milan was of little value in itself, but its possession was indispensable if French armies were to operate in the centre or south.

Conquest of the Milanese (1499–1500).—Before attempting this conquest, Louis renewed the treaties which Charles had made with his neighbours and sought allies in Italy. The Duke of Savoy opened the Alps to him and undertook to follow him with his troops; Venice was promised Cremona and Ghiara d'Adda; Florence was to receive the submission of the rebel Pisa; the pope was gained; Caesar Borgia had already been gratified with the French duchy of Valentinois. Ludovico, the first traitor to the Italian cause, was isolated by his treason. Trivulzio, an Italian who had passed to the service of Louis XII., had merely to appear in the Milanese with 9000 horse and 13,000 foot soldiers. Ludovico, abandoned by all, fled to Tyrol, while the Gascon troops entering Milan broke his statue, the masterpiece of Leonardo da Vinci, to pieces (October 2, 1499).

Loss and Second Conquest of the Milanese (1500).—The faulty administration of Trivulzio, a former Guelf who persecuted his political opponents, afforded Ludovico an opportunity. He returned with a band of adventurers, Swiss or Germans, and surprised Milan (February 5). But a new French army crossed the Alps and met the force of Ludovico near Novara (April, 1500). The Swiss formed the main part of both armies; they preferred to sell their services a second time rather than cut each other's throats, and the victory rested with him who could pay best. Louis XII. was also the official ally of the Swiss, and promised the troops of Ludovico that they should not fight against a force in which the banners of the cantons were displayed. The duke attempted to fly disguised as a common soldier or a monk; he was handed over by a Swiss from the canton of Uri, sent to France, and after remaining shut up in the château of Loches for ten years, died at the moment of his release. His two sons reached Germany, whence they later returned. The Swiss, as they retired, seized Bellinzona, which commanded the valley of the Ticino and one of the routes to Italy. The lesson which Louis XII. had received was not lost; Cardinal George d'Amboise, who was employed to organise the conquest, treated the Milanese with leniency. He established a kind of parliament in

their capital, modelled on those of France, which gave the country impartial justice, a thing hitherto almost unknown to it, and he entrusted the government of the province to his nephew, the Lord of Chaumont, whose prudent and firm administration soon caused Milan to forget her former masters, who had so often treated her with a foolish cruelty.

Partition of the Kingdom of Naples (1500–1503).—The Milanese having been conquered Louis aimed at Naples, but instead of adopting the adventurous policy of his predecessor, he engaged in a kind of diplomatic campaign. He first assured himself of the neutrality or support of central Italy. The Florentines received help from him against Pisa, which was in a state of perpetual revolt, though the French troops long spared the heroic inhabitants of that city, who fought to the cry, "Vive la France." Alexander VI. wished to convert Romagna into a principality for his son, Caesar Borgia, but a thousand petty tyrants had converted that province into a nest of bandits. Some French troops assisted Caesar, a past-master in crimes and treason, to subdue the petty and bloody baronage of the Romagna. (Caesar was taken by Machiavelli for the hero of his book, *Il Principe*.)

France had thus become the dominating power in the centre and north of Italy. But Louis had wider aims. He hoped, in order to secure the kingdom of Naples without striking a blow, to divide it with Ferdinand the Catholic. By the Treaty of Grenada (1500) he reserved to himself the title of king, with the possession of Naples, Gaëta, the Abruzzi, and the Terra di Lavoro; Ferdinand asked only Apulia and Calabria with the title of duke. Louis overreached himself. All began well; the unhappy King of Naples, Frederic III., a popular prince, had confidently opened his fortresses to the Spanish general, Gonsalvo di Cordova, but when he asked help from Spain against the French, who were already on the frontier, he found that he had been betrayed (June, 1501). More angered against the traitor than against the enemy, Frederic handed over Naples and Château Neuf to the French, retiring to the Isle of Ischia. He afterwards surrendered to Louis XII., who gave him a pension of 30,000 livres and the county of Maine. He joined another captive Italian prince, Ludovico il Moro, on the banks of the Loire (1501), where he died three years later.

War in Naples between the Spaniards and the French (1502).—The conquest was completed, but the work of division did not proceed so amicably. The Spaniards and the French quarrelled

as to the tax of 200,000 ducats, payable on the herds which in the autumn passed from the heights of the Abruzzi into the Apulian plain. No mention had been made in the treaty of the Basilicata (Matera), the Capitanate (Foggia), or the farthest principality (Avellino), and each party claimed them. War began. The French viceroy, the Duke of Nemours, who was in force, speedily blockaded his opponent, Gonsalvo, in Barletta (1502). Ferdinand had recourse to one of his ordinary ruses. His son-in-law, Philip the Handsome, held the former Burgundian lands in the Low Countries, and in right of his wife, Joanna the Mad, was heir of Castille. He was then passing through France and was allowed to conclude the Treaty of Lyons by which hostilities were suspended and all was apparently settled; he was then disavowed by Ferdinand, who had reinforced Gonsalvo and ordered him to continue the war. Louis complained that he had been deceived for the second time. "He lies," retorted Ferdinand, "I have deceived him ten times." Nemours was unable to punish the treachery. Instead of concentrating his forces in order to take Barletta and make an end of the Spaniards there, he wasted time in skirmishes and engaged in fights which made the reputation of some knights but did not advance the king's interest. An example was the celebrated duel between Bayard and Sotomayor. The paladins of Ariosto fought no better. Meanwhile Spanish reinforcements arrived; Gonsalvo was relieved and Louis' best lieutenant, d'Aubigny, was defeated at Seminara and lost Calabria (April 21, 1503). Nemours, to repair this reverse, rashly attacked the enemy near Cerignola, where he was defeated and slain (April 28). Venosa and Gaëta alone remained to the French.

Loss of the Kingdom of Naples (1503).—Louis XII. made great preparations to take vengeance for this treachery. He sent two armies to the Pyrenees, but effected nothing, and a third across the Alps which fared no better. La Trémoille was in command; he was delayed for some time near Rome by the strange death of Alexander VI. and by the intrigues which accompanied the election of his successor. Gonsalvo had time to prepare his defence; posted on the Garigliano, he checked La Trémoille despite the exploits of Bayard; captured his artillery (December 27), and pushed into the suburbs of Gaëta, where La Trémoille was forced to surrender (January 1, 1504). Louis d'Ars, who commanded at Venosa, refused all capitulation, and with the remnants of his army forced his way heroically back to France.

Treaties of Blois (1504–1505).—There was reason to fear that the loss of Milan would follow that of Naples, as Maximilian already inclined to enforce imperial rights south of the Alps and Gonsalvo advanced northwards. Louis divided his enemies by three treaties which were signed on the same day at Blois (September 22, 1504). The first contained the embryo of the League of Cambrai since Louis and Maximilian agreed to attack Venice and divide the spoils. By the second treaty Louis promised the King of the Romans 200,000 francs in return for the investiture of Milan. By the third he renounced the kingdom of Naples on condition that it should pass to Charles of Austria, grandson of Maximilian, who was to marry Madame Claude, daughter of Louis XII., and to receive as her dower, in addition to all that Louis held or claimed in Italy, three French provinces, Burgundy, Brittany, and the county of Blois. No more disastrous convention could have been signed. This young Charles, to whom the daughter of the French king was promised, was heir to Philip the Handsome, his father, in the Low Countries; to his mother in Castille; to his paternal grandfather in Austria; and to his maternal grandfather in Aragon. He was assured of Italy; France was to be dismembered for him; he was to be granted the empire of Europe. Anne, who was rather Duchess of Brittany than Queen of France, was delighted and proud to secure so brilliant a marriage for her daughter, even at the expense of France, but France complained and Louis seized the first opportunity of returning to his duty.

Rupture of the Treaties of Blois.—Louis found his opportunity in 1505, when Ferdinand the Catholic, irritated against his son-in-law, attempted to disinherit him by contracting a second marriage. He married Germaine de Foix, niece of Louis XII., and the King of France, by another treaty, also signed at Blois (October, 1505), once more ceded his rights to Naples, this time to his niece, thus breaking one of the conditions for the marriage of Madame Claude. Brittany and Burgundy were still involved in the earlier treaties. Louis summoned the States-General at Tours that the arrangements might be openly rescinded (May 14, 1506). The States declared that the fundamental law of the monarchy did not permit the alienation of two provinces which formed part of the demesne of the crown. It prayed the king to marry his daughter Claude to his heir-presumptive, Francis, Duke of Angoulême, in order to secure the territorial integrity and independence of France. Louis made no difficulty in granting a request in accord with his own wishes and on this occasion he

possibly deceived the deceivers. Maximilian, always full of ambition and always in a state of penury; Ferdinand, charged after the death of Philip the Handsome with the regency and guardianship of his grandson, Charles of Austria, did not offer opposition. Louis XII. was even able in the following year, without being disturbed, to bring back to their duty those "proud villains," the Genoese, who were in revolt. "Tradesmen, merchants," cried Bayard, "defend yourselves with your awls and leave alone pikes and lances, to which you are not used." The merchant people made a brave resistance and the valiant La Palice was wounded. But the king had set vast forces on foot; Genoa was taken; her charter of liberty was burned by the hand of the common hangman; sixty of her bravest defenders were executed; and the seigniory of the town, with the islands of Corsica and Chios, were reunited to the royal demesne. The Genoese had further to pay a fine of 200,000 crowns and to construct at their own expense the fortress of the Lantern which was designed to keep them in order (1507).

League of Cambrai (1508).—The republic of Venice, allied sometimes with one, sometimes with the other party, was the only one of the Italian powers which had profited amid all the disasters of the peninsula. But her political astuteness could not succeed for ever; a time was bound to come when every one would turn against this power which gained at the expense of all. Not only were the Venetians envied for their wealth, their thousand ships and 30,000 sailors; all her neighbours had cause to complain of her. Louis XII. regretted the loss of Cremona, which he had recently ceded, and Crema, Brescia, and Bergamo, which had long since been lost to the duchy of Milan. Ferdinand the Catholic desired certain towns on the coast of the kingdom of Naples which he had pledged in return for sums which he had borrowed from the republic. Julius II. claimed Ravenna, Cervia, Faenza, and Rimini, old possessions of the holy see. Maximilian aspired to Verona, Vicenza, Padua, and Treviso in the name of the empire, and to Friuli and Trieste in the name of the house of Austria. All this jealousy and greed led to the alliance of the various powers in the League of Cambrai against the republic (December 10, 1508). The soul of the league was Pope Julius II., a fiery old man who wished to be "lord and master of the world game." He proposed to accomplish two objects: to restore the temporal power of the papacy and to expel the barbarians from Italy. But he seemed to find the barbarians useful in aiding him first of all to recover that

which he held to belong to the patrimony of St. Peter, and on April 27, 1509, he laid Venice under an interdict in which her magistrates, citizens, and supporters were included.

Victory of Agnadello (1509).—Louis XII. was the first of the allies to take the field, passing the Adda (April 15) at the head of more than 20,000 infantry and 2300 cavalry. The two *condottieri* in the service of Venice, Pitigliano and Alviano, acted independently, and on the ground that the senate had forbidden fighting, Pitigliano abandoned his colleague. Louis XII. met Alviano on the dyke of Agnadello (May 14, 1509). The Venetians at first held firm; the king who was in the first rank shouted in vain, "Children, your king watches you." The French could make no advance. Louis exposed himself to fire like any common soldier. "Let him who is afraid hide behind me; a true King of France never dies from a cannon ball," he cried. Finally, Bayard and some determined knights crossed the marsh and fell on the flank of the Venetians. The cavalry fled in panic while the infantry were annihilated, eight or ten thousand men being left on the battlefield with all the artillery and baggage. This victory left the road to the lagoons clear to the French; not a place resisted, such as attempted to do so being terribly dealt with. Louis, so good-natured in France, was cruel in Italy; he put every garrison to the sword which dared to hold out against him, and hanged all the peasants who cried "Viva San Marco." The republic saved itself by a stroke of wisdom which was also the result of profound calculation. She withdrew her troops from all the cities of the mainland and released her subjects from their allegiance. Those subjects felt obliged to remain loyal to masters who relied only on their devotion, while Venice, self-supporting and impregnable in the midst of the sea, waited for discord to arise among the allies. She had not long to wait.

The Holy League (1511).—Pope Julius II. had attained his first object; the towns of the Romagna fell again into his hands. He now aimed at his second object; he planned the expulsion of the barbarians and, without regard for his recent alliance, he determined to begin with the French, whom he had been foremost in summoning to the peninsula under Charles VIII., when he was merely Cardinal Julian de la Rovere, the mortal foe of Alexander VI. On February 2, 1510, he absolved the republic of Venice; he easily detached Ferdinand from the League of Cambrai, since that king had already gathered all the fruits which he desired. He undermined the never steadfast constancy of Maximilian and entered into intrigues with the Swiss (whose

subsidies Louis XII. had refused to increase) by the medium of the Cardinal of Sion, Matthew Schinner. The Duke of Ferrara, the ally of France, and the city of Genoa were attacked without success. But Louis XII. hesitated; this was no ordinary war. The queen, full of religious scruples, made a struggle with the head of Christendom a matter of conscience. The clergy of France met at Tours, and far from sharing the scruples of the king, granted from their goods a subsidy of 300,000 crowns, declaring any excommunications which the pope might launch against Louis and his kingdom null and void, asserting that in this purely political question the war was waged not by the pontiff but by the ruler of the Roman states.

The struggle was waged with little skill on either side. Chaumont, at the head of some French troops, resolutely surprised the papal army before Bologna, and Bayard only failed "by the space of a paternoster" from laying hands on the pontifical stole. Attacked as a prince, Julius II. defended himself as a soldier; he entered Mirandola through the breach (January 20, 1511) and would possibly have secured further successes but for a rising of the Bolognese who destroyed his statue, the work of Michael Angelo. Forced to retire, he was defeated at Casalecchio and returned ill to Rome. Louis XII. thought that the time had come to attack the pope himself. He called a general council at Pisa to examine the conduct of Julius and to depose him. This was a mistake, since it changed the character of the struggle. In place of a feeble temporal prince there appeared an all-powerful spiritual prince. Julius laid Pisa under an interdict, excommunicated the dissentient cardinals, assembled another council at St. John Lateran, and invoked the help of the Catholic powers of Europe. All answered his appeal, Ferdinand of Spain, Henry VIII. of England, Maximilian, the Venetian republic, and the Swiss, who were flattered with the title of *Defenders of the Holy See*. They formed a *Holy League* with the ostensible object of saving the Church from schism and with the real intention of driving the French across the Alps (October 5, 1511).

Victory and Death of Gaston de Foix (1511–1512).—The Spaniard, Ramon de Cardona, joined the pontifical army with 12,000 troops. The Venetians, thanks to the diversion, gradually recovered the places which they had lost; 10,000 Swiss, led by Matthew Schinner, descended from the mountains. Treason worked in the German troops and garrisons which were still in the service of Louis XII. in Italy, while the frontiers of France itself were threatened on the north, east, and south. A young

and heroic general, the king's nephew, Gaston de Foix, Duke of Nemours, overcame all the dangers in a moment. At the age of twenty-two he was placed in command of the army of Italy. With sword and money in hand he turned back the Swiss into their mountains (December, 1511). Bologna was pressed by the Spanish and papal troops; he threw himself on the town and raised the siege (February 7, 1512). The Germans had handed over Brescia to the Venetians; Gaston appeared suddenly under the walls, carried the place by storm (February 19), and gave it up for seven days to sack and pillage, 22,000 persons being killed. He only spared the house to which the wounded Bayard had been borne. Finally, in April Gaston appeared under the walls of Ravenna and placed himself boldly between the town and the camp of Cardona. After some vain attacks on the city, he turned against the enemy camp (April 11). His infantry were repulsed, but his artillery wrought havoc in the allied army and the French gendarmerie put the papal cavalry to flight. The Spanish infantry retreated steadily; Gaston grew angry, followed and charged with a few men; he defeated them, but fell with fifteen wounds on his face.

Loss of Italy.—It would have been far better for Louis XII. to have lost the battle and preserved this young and valiant general, "a great captain before he was a soldier," says Guicciardini. La Palice succeeded though he could not replace Gaston de Foix. Julius II. regained his courage and in the Lateran Council pronounced against Louis XII. a sentence reminiscent of the Middle Ages. The French army, abandoned by its German auxiliaries whom Maximilian had recalled, fell back before Cardona, allowed Bologna to be retaken, and found in their rear 20,000 Swiss. They had entered the duchy to restore Maximilian Sforza, the son of Ludovico, and to seize for themselves Locarno, one of the gates of Italy, while the Grisons, on the other side, were taking Chiavenna and the Valteline. La Palice, after a battle fought in the streets of Pavia, retired into Piedmont; many bodies of troops which could not rejoin him were massacred without pity. At Ravenna four French officers were buried alive, their heads left above the ground to prolong their agony. In the midst of these events Julius II. died (February 21, 1513). He had secured Parma and Piacenza and his dying eyes had seen the French in flight. He had succeeded in taking Italy from them, but he had given it to the Spaniards; it was merely a change of masters and not a change for the better. His successor, Leo X., continued his designs. He renewed at Malines the

Holy League, which the Venetians had abandoned to rejoin Louis, and the invasion of France itself was resolved upon.

Defeat of Novara and Battle of the Spurs: Invasion of France (1513).—Ferdinand, already master of Spanish Navarre, south of the Pyrenees, was waiting only for a favourable occasion to seize French Navarre, north of those mountains, and an English army was ready to land at Calais. Louis XII. faced the storm; though threatened even in his own kingdom he did not abandon Italy. La Trémoille and Trivulzio entered the peninsula with a fine army and with Maximilian Sforza blockaded the Swiss in Novara. But a relieving force, sent by the cantons, entered the town by night. In the morning the Swiss made a sortie with levelled pikes, advanced straight upon the French artillery, captured it despite the havoc in their ranks, and after a short though bloody battle routed the besieging army (June 6). Genoa profited by this disaster to recover her independence and Louis had no longer any possessions beyond the Alps.

It was many years since the provinces of France had seen hostile armies. Now the Swiss on the east and the English on the north invaded them. The Emperor Maximilian joined the latter, serving as a soldier at the rate of a hundred crowns a day. Near Guinegate a panic seized the French army. Bayard tried to check the enemy and was taken; the others fought only with their spurs, which gave their name to the battle (August 16). The Swiss, 20,000 in number, penetrated as far as Dijon, where they were checked by La Trémoille by means of much money and more promises (September 13). France's only ally, James IV. of Scotland, shared in her evil fortune, being defeated and killed at Flodden by the English (September 9).

Battles at Sea.—It is too often forgotten that the French navy does not only date from the time of Colbert. Gascon, Breton, and Norman sailors, long before the days of Jean Bart and Duguay-Trouin, had often put English corsairs to flight and attacked the English coasts. The merchant marine had also begun its history. Dieppe discovered the south-west coast of Africa, where her merchants traded long before the arrival of the Portuguese, and the men of Bayonne created their great whale fishery. After the beginning of the Italian wars the sailors of Provence and the galleys of Marseilles rendered important services to France, especially the brave and able Prégent de Bidoulx. In 1513 Prégent was called with his oared galleys from the Mediterranean to the ocean to oppose the English attacks on the French coast.

On April 25, he fell in with the English fleet, commanded by Admiral Edward Howard, and took shelter in the creek of Le Conquet near Brest; the admiral followed him and attacked him, boarding the flagship. Prégent had a single combat with the admiral, wounded him, threw him dead on the bridge of his ship, and sank the nearest vessel. Another ship, threatened with the same fate, fled, and the whole fleet withdrew. Prégent in his turn appeared on the coast of England and ravaged Sussex.

Some months later the fleet which had landed the army of Henry VIII. at Calais cruised down the Breton coasts and met (August 10) the French, who had only twenty ships, drawn from Brittany and Normandy, under the command of Hervé Primoguet. The English were two or three times superior in numbers, but the French had the advantage of the wind and attacked boldly. At the first encounter many of the English vessels were sunk. One French ship performed wonders, *La Belle Cordelière*, which Anne of Brittany had caused to be built at Morlaix and ornamented at great expense. Primoguet commanded her. Surrounded by twelve enemy ships, she had already dismasted some and forced others to retire, when from the top of one of the English ships a mass of artificial fire was thrown down which at once set everything ablaze. Some of the sailors and soldiers saved themselves in the boats, but Primoguet refused to leave the ship which the queen had entrusted to him. Yet his death cost the enemy dear. He steered straight for the English flagship, in which were many nobles, fastened himself to her by grappling irons, set her on fire, and perished with her. His heroic deed took place in view of Ushant.

Treaties of Peace.—But sea fights at this period had only a secondary importance. Questions were decided on land, and the triple invasion of France forced Louis to treat. By the Treaty of Dijon, France had already been freed from the Swiss. Louis disavowed the Council of Pisa to regain the pope and agreed to the Treaty of Orleans with the emperor and Ferdinand (March, 1514). Henry VIII. refused for some time to lay down his arms; the Treaty of London, which left him Tournai and assured him an annual pension of 100,000 crowns for ten years, restored peace between England and France. It was confirmed by the marriage of Louis XII. with Mary, sister of the English king. Thus, after fifteen years of war, after the loss of many men and much treasure, France was no further advanced across the Alps than at the death of Charles VIII.; the kingdom of

Naples and the Milanese, many times conquered by France, were still lost to her at this time.

New Policy.—Since the time of the crusades, the French had not fought external wars, but the acts of the reign of Louis XII. all occurred beyond the Alps in Italy. Louis XI. ended internal strife; Charles VIII. began foreign wars. The monarchy having nothing left to conquer at home, sought to make conquests abroad. The same revolution which had occurred in France had also taken place in England, Spain, and Austria, with the result that all these princes, holding almost absolute authority, were free to look beyond their own frontiers. As soon as they saw France crossing her borders they united to compel her return. That isolation of states which was characteristic of the Middle Ages ceased; henceforth, leagues and general wars became common, which involved more and more all the European peoples and brought their history into touch with that of France. Kings had two interests to pursue, to defend and add to their realms and to practise wise administration. Louis XII. fulfilled the first of these functions poorly; for his fulfilment of the second there is little but praise.

Beneficent Administration of the Father of the People: Cardinal d'Amboise.—The accession of Louis XII. to the throne had added to the royal demesne the duchy of Orleans and the counties of Valois and Blois, his appanages. With the proceeds of his demesne he undertook to meet all his personal expenditure and the upkeep of his household, and was thus able to reduce the *taille* by almost a third, to 2,600,000 livres, or about 68,000,000 francs. The revenue was scrupulously employed for the payment of the army, the encouragement of industry, for agriculture, public works, and the improvement of the royal châteaux, the last being a work of public utility when directed by taste and art and serving to popularise both. Graces, pensions, ruinous fêtes were abolished. "I would rather," said Louis to his courtiers, "see men laugh at my avarice than see the people lament my extravagance." A tax had been established for the expedition against Genoa; the campaign was short and less expensive than had been estimated. Louis returned the balance of the tax to the people, saying that the money would fructify better in their hands than in his. He freed the peasants from the rapacity of the soldiery; those guilty of looting were executed, after which "no one was so bold as to take anything without paying, and the cocks crowed boldly in the fields without danger." Agriculture flourished, and commerce increased to

a degree hitherto unknown in France. "The third part of the kingdom," says a contemporary, "was put under cultivation in twelve years, and where one great merchant was formerly found at Paris, or Lyons, or Rouen, fifty could be found under Louis XII., and these thought no more of journeying to Rome, Naples, or London than their predecessors had thought of going to Lyons or Geneva." "The revenue of benefices, lands, and lordships," adds Claude Seyssel, "has everywhere increased, and I am told by those who are in chief charge of the finances of the realm, men of standing and authority, that the *taille* is now raised much more easily and with less force and expense than it ever was in the time of any previous king." Louis only summoned the States-General once, in 1506; even then, only the third estate was formally called. It was these States which, by the lips of one of the representatives of Paris, gave Louis the best title that any king can deserve, that of Father of the People, and the epithet was just, for, as St. Gelais says, "There was never such a prosperous time as under his reign."

Louis' name has always been united to that of his worthy adviser, George d'Amboise, who for twenty-seven years was less his minister than his friend. D'Amboise was born in 1460 of an illustrious family, who secured for him at the age of fourteen the bishopric of Montauban. Attached at an early age to the young Duke of Orleans, he shared his ill-fortune under the administration of Anne of Beaujeu. But the prince did not forget him when credit was restored to him, and he obtained the archbishopric of Narbonne, which in 1493 he exchanged for that of Rouen. Louis himself held the government of Normandy and left the chief power in the hands of the archbishop, whom he named his lieutenant, and who began there those useful reforms which after the death of Charles VIII. he extended over the whole kingdom. He loved the people as the king loved him, and was beloved in return. "Leave it to George," became a popular saying. Made cardinal, Governor of Milan, Legate of the Holy See in France, Amboise might have been pope after the death of Alexander VI. if the choice had rested with Louis and the French army. He had the greatest influence on the affairs of France and of Italy, and if, like his master, he erred much in his foreign policy, his administration had a character of probity and goodness which was not again found for long after his time. It must be remembered that as an all-powerful minister he did not oppose the first Treaty of Blois and that at

his death he left vast riches which would have been more in place in the hands of the poor.

Two New Parliaments.—The parliaments, exercising in the name of the king supreme justice over the provinces under their control, were the strongest instrument which the crown could have for bringing all privileged persons under the control of the law and the most independent spirits under the yoke of common obedience. Louis XI. had increased their number; Louis XII., from motives of equity, increased them still further, creating the two new parliaments of Provence (1501) and Normandy (1499). The Great Council, a species of Council of State, had been fixed to meet at one place by Charles VIII.

Compilation of Customary Law.—To facilitate the administration of justice, Charles VII. had projected the codifying and publication of provincial customs, the usages which constituted the law in each province, in order to free suitors from the arbitrary power of the judges. Charles VIII. published seven codes; twenty others were reduced to writing between 1505 and 1514, edited by experts with mature deliberation, and printed. This publication was the most important legislative work of the ancient regime until the great ordinances of Louis XIV., since it was no servile reproduction of ancient practices and was less an edition than a reform of the customary law, carried out in an anti-feudal spirit such as prevailed at the time among the lawyers and in the parliament.

Reforms in the Judicial Administration.—An ordinance of 1510 abolished the use of Latin in criminal cases, which were in future to be conducted in the common language of the land that witnesses might understand their depositions and the accused the charges brought against them. An edict of 1490 had already effected the same reform in the courts and in the acts of the civil power. The lawyers consumed the substance of the poor by the length and expense of cases; Louis attempted to reduce their extortions. The kingdom was divided into provostships and bailiwicks, and the bailiffs, nobles, and men of the sword united administrative, judicial, and military functions, which they performed inefficiently. Louis XII. forced them to graduate at the universities or to leave the administration of justice in the hands of deputies chosen from the ranks of the lawyers. The nobles were at the same time forced to place only learned men or licentiates on their tribunals and to assure them their salaries.

Venality of Offices.—One charge must be brought against Louis XII. He sold certain public offices in order to secure

resources without demanding new taxes. With some exceptions, however, he only sold financial posts, which was a very ancient practice. The venality of judicial posts, often appearing during the period prior to Louis XII., became officially established under Francis I. An ordinance of 1506 permitted private persons to use the postal relays established under Louis XI.

Beginning of the Renaissance in Letters and Art.—The Italian wars were fatal to those who made them and in their final phase were almost fatal to France. The forces of the state were turned from their real object and the right policy of France was abandoned to the private interests of the king. But the kingdom suffered no internal disturbance as a result of these wars and if no territory was gained, French civilisation entered actively by their means into the paths of the Renaissance. Since the thirteenth century France had passed through so many misfortunes that culture had been arrested. Art no longer showed the fine though severe grandeur of the age of St. Louis, and in the fifteenth century the flamboyant Gothic style reigned supreme; architectural lines, once so pure, were multiplied and twisted in a thousand directions. Architecture ceased to be either simple or great; in an effort to escape from the old style it became unnatural and no new style was found. The French language in Joinville, Froissart, and Charles of Orleans was naïf and graceful, but sustained force was wanting to the French writers, with the exception of Comines, because the great models of antiquity remained almost unknown to them. Italy, however, was rediscovering the treasure of the past. Aretino and Poggio in letters, Leonardo da Vinci and Brunelleschi in art, produced, after the date of Dante and Petrarch, after St. Francis of Assisi and the campanile of Florence, a renaissance which was entirely pagan and ancient. There was more translation and imitation than original work; poetic inspiration was cast in the mould of Horace and Virgil and the most eloquent aspired only to speak like Cicero.

The French entered Italy at the moment when this movement had reached the height of its vigour and they carried back over the mountains a taste for these new things. Antiquity found its zealous admirers in France. The savant, Gaguin, patronised by Louis XII., formed a precious library of ancient manuscripts. The Greeks Lascaris and Jerome Alexander found pupils in France who eclipsed their masters, men such as Vatable, Bude, who restored the study of Greek, and Danès, the master of Amyot.

The memory of the fair cities, the rich palaces, and all the elegance of Milan, Rome, and Florence inspired the idea of securing for French towns more air and better communications, while, as the royal provosts made thick walls useless, manor houses were built with a greater view to comfort. Architecture became less massive, admitting more air and light. The French artists themselves entered into these new paths, but the Italian masters had already realised the marvels of which the French dreamed. Some of these Italians crossed the mountains and hastened the artistic revolution by their coming. Charles VIII. caused Italian artists to work on the château of Amboise. Louis XII. made Fra Giocondo his royal architect and employed him to rebuild on solid foundations the bridge Notre-Dame, which fell for the fourth time in 1499. The same architect constructed the great chamber of the parliament which still exists and a chamber for the court of accounts which was burned in 1737, and was possibly responsible for the eastern façade of the château of Blois, the most original part of that curious monument.

Cardinal d'Amboise shared his master's tastes. He employed Roger Ango to begin the *Palais de Justice* at Rouen, which affords a beautiful example of the mingling of old and new, of Gothic architecture transformed by the Renaissance. The same artist executed important repairs to the cathedral of Rouen. But the chief work of George d'Amboise was the château of Gaillon, which he designed as the residence of the Archbishops of Rouen, and where the Renaissance triumphantly threw down all traces of the older manors, levelled the old tower with the ground, replaced the pointed arch by the round arch, and produced the medallion statuettes and that rich and smiling ornamentation which appears on every side in place of the grimacing and weird figures of Gothic art. The church of St. Maclou at Rouen, the chapel of the Hôtel de Cluny at Paris and the Hôtel la Trémoille, now destroyed, the Hôtels de Ville of Compiègne, Arras, St. Quentin, and Nevers all date from the reign of Louis XII.

Death of Louis XII. (1515).—The peace which Louis XII. established after the dangers of 1514 would certainly have made his reign more fertile in beneficent institutions and masterpieces. But he did not long survive it. Anne of Brittany died on January 9, 1514; Louis mourned his Breton girl, as he called her, and did nothing but weep for eight days. On August 7 in the same year he married a sister of Henry VIII., Mary of England,

a young girl of sixteen, who forced him to change his simple and regular life. For some months there were only feasts and tourneys. Louis had been accustomed to dine at eight ; he now had to dine at midday. He had gone to bed at six ; now he often remained up till midnight. He had always been in feeble health since a serious illness in 1504, and this mode of life killed him. He died on January 1, 1515, at the age of fifty-three, sincerely mourned by his subjects.

TENTH PERIOD — FIRST STRUGGLE OF FRANCE WITH THE HOUSE OF AUSTRIA: GROWING POWER OF THE CROWN: THE RENAISSANCE

(1515–1559)

CHAPTER XXXIX

FRANCIS I. (1515–1547)

France at the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century.—With the sixteenth century a new era in the history of France begins. During the preceding four hundred years her kings had been engaged on the task which the Carolingians had already once accomplished, of consolidating the state and reviving central authority, of rescuing France and her monarchy from the power of the nobles. The English hindered the accomplishment of this arduous work for a hundred years; they were at last finally expelled, and in most directions the royal demesne was extended to the natural frontiers of the country. With the exception of Calais, on the North Sea, no dominion save that of the king was known on the shores of the Channel and the Atlantic; no other gate was open to foreign intrusion. The whole southern frontier of the Pyrenees was French, with the exception of Roussillon, which had been so foolishly given up by Charles VIII. France held Marseilles on the Mediterranean, on the shores of which she afterwards established the port of Toulon. She was bounded by the Alps as far as Savoy. But on the north and north-east her frontier was ill-defined. By the retrocession of Franche-Comté she had lost the barrier of the Jura; by that of Artois she had exposed Paris to attack. On this side it was very difficult to protect the capital from the enemy and for a considerable period no attempt was made to repair this weakness. The mistaken policy of Charles VIII. directed his forces towards Italy, where they perished without result, forces which should have been employed on the northern and eastern frontiers.

But in spite of the defective character of the frontier of

France, one important result had been achieved. France already extended from the Channel to the Mediterranean, from the Pyrenees to the Meuse, forming a great country, lying between Spain, England, Germany, and Italy, capable of holding the balance between them. She was thus open to the various influences of these lands and able to extend her own influence over them in turn, to the great profit of the common civilisation of Europe.

In the internal organisation of the state the kings had already made considerable progress in the task of establishing centralisation and unity. The communes, petty and jealous republics, had been compelled to resign their local privileges; the feudal lords had lost their independence. Moreover, the serfs had in great measure been enfranchised, with the result that the exaltation of one class and the repression of others had brought all into closer touch and formed them into a great people. Divergencies still existed, but from the time of Joan of Arc unity was more apparent than diversity; all displayed the same spirit in relations with foreign lands. Once there had been peasants, lords, fiefs; now there was a people, a king—France.

Proof of this growing nationality is afforded by the development and spread of the French language, which by an edict of Louis XII., renewed and amplified by Francis I., was introduced into public acts, in which it replaced Latin, and which was used equally by Montaigne from Gascony, Rabelais from Touraine, and by Amyot, who was born at Melun in the Ile de France.

To enable French society to free itself from the civil institutions of the Middle Ages, as it had already been delivered from the political institutions of feudalism, was the work accomplished by monarchical power during the period which begins with the Renaissance. Externally, France, after having checked the further development of the overgrown power of the house of Austria, was gradually extended to the limits of ancient Gaul and was able to compel Europe itself to accept her hegemony. The French language, thanks to the great writers of the eighteenth century, became the medium of diplomacy throughout the continent; a knowledge of it was a necessity to the *élite* of European society, as it was the model for polite intercourse. French literature dominated the mind of the world, and even in times of disaster and defeat France was consoled for the loss of an empire which her arms could no longer maintain by the softer and more effective influence which she owed to her genius,

to her arts, her letters, and her science. France became the second fatherland of the world; her history has been studied, her language learned in every country.

The king with whose reign this new era began embodied the age of transition in which he lived. In some of his faults he recalled the period which had closed; in some of his qualities he represented that which was beginning.

Francis I. (1515–1547).—Louis XII. was succeeded by Francis I., a descendant of that Duke of Orleans who had been murdered in 1407. The "Father of the People" was replaced by a "gentlemen's king." The new sovereign was handsome, strong, brave, and accomplished. He was as reckless of his life in battle as he was of the property of his subjects in the fêtes which constantly took place at his court. Though imperious he was easily led; he was a patron of arts and letters and was himself an author. Both his vices and his virtues were carried to excess. Louis XII., witnessing his folly and youthful exuberance, had declared, "That great baby will ruin everything." But he was mistaken. With the pride of power, Francis I. appreciated the grandeur of the French nation. By his courage, and upon occasion by his prudence, a quality more difficult for him to exercise, he frequently repaired the errors into which he had been led by his favourites. If he acquired no new territory he at least preserved France intact, and he did so at a critical time and in face of the greatest enemy with which she had yet been called upon to contend. He increased taxation and spent lavishly, but he reformed the administration of justice and greatly assisted the progress of literature and art. His vices and faults were concealed under a certain brilliancy; they were atoned for by his chivalrous generosity and by his royal splendour. Francis I. does not rank among the best of the Kings of France; he has his place among the most remarkable.

Francis had often been filled with indignation at the complaisance which Louis XII. had shown towards the parliament and the clergy, and he had early resolved that, when he should be master of the situation, he would give a very different and more vigorous tone to the administration. Duprat, a shrewd though unscrupulous man, was made chancellor and was charged with the duty of putting into practice these new maxims of government.

The king's impatience led him to revolt against the treaties which his predecessor had concluded. Of these, one was only a truce for a year; he did not renew it and prepared to cross the

Alps, having given the constable's sword to the Duke of Bourbon, an impetuous character capable of great deeds but unsuited to fulfil the rôle of a subject. He entrusted the regency to his mother, Louise of Savoy, a vain, covetous, and malignant woman, with many faults and only one good quality, her love for her son.

Marignano (1515) : Bayard.—A formidable army was assembled at Lyons and in Dauphiné. It consisted of 18,000 infantry, drawn mainly from Gascony ; 20,000 German foot soldiers ; seventy great cannon and three hundred smaller pieces, directed by the grand master of Genouillac, a worthy successor to Jean Bureau. Among the commanders were included the Constable Bourbon, Marshals la Palice, Lautrec, d'Aubigny, and Trivulzio, the Dukes of Châtellerault, Vendôme, Alençon, Lorraine, Gueldres, Albany, and a great engineer, Pedro Navarro. But there was a mere lieutenant of an artillery company who outshone all these nobles, Bayard, the knight " sans peur et sans reproche," who " was worth an army in himself."

Venice at war with the Spaniards, and Genoa threatened by the Duke of Milan, summoned Francis to enter Italy. Charles of Austria, the young ruler of the Low Countries, had entered into negotiations with him despite his two grandfathers, the Emperor Maximilian and the King of Aragon. But these two last princes, Pope Leo X., and the Duke of Milan had renewed their alliance, and 20,000 Swiss in their pay guarded the passes of Mont Cenis and Mont Genèvre, the only two routes by which it was supposed to be possible for a French army to descend into the plain of Piedmont. As these two routes united at Susa, the Swiss had established a camp of 10,000 men there.

Francis began his campaign by a master-stroke. Chamois hunters and shepherds from the Alps of Dauphiné acted as guides to Trivulzio, Lautrec, and Navarro ; it was discovered that at the cost of great exertions it was possible to ascend the valley of Bracelonnette and to descend into that of the Stura, passing over the Col d'Argentière, which was held to be impracticable. It was necessary to bridge abysses and to blast rocks in order to open a passage for the artillery. The army occupied three days in scaling the Alps ; it reached the crest of the great chain on the evening of the third ; on the fourth it reached Argentière and the sources of the Stura ; and on the fifth it descended into the plain of Saluzzo (August 15). A force of cavalry under La Palice, d'Aubigny, and Bayard crossed the Col d'Agnello, on the south side of Monte Viso, higher up by another chamois track, and surprised Prosper Colonna, the general of the

papal troops, at table in Villafranca. He was taken with seven hundred of his knights. The left of the enemy's positions was thus turned. The Swiss were surprised, and fell back upon Milan in order to effect a junction with the Spanish army which watched the Venetians. The French followed them to Marignano, and as the pay which the allies had promised them had not arrived, they entered into negotiations with the king. Francis offered them 700,000 gold crowns and a pension to Sforza, Duke of Milan, who was with them. The war seemed about to end without a battle when 20,000 more Swiss descended from the Alps. Matthew Schinner, Cardinal of Sion, a bitter enemy of France, reproached the others with having abandoned the holy see. The stipulated sums were already on their way to the Swiss, and they resolved to effect a double blow, to capture the convoy and to surprise the French army.

On September 13 "the bull of Uri and the cow of Unterwalden," two great trumpets which had in the past sounded at Granson and Morat, caused their notes to re-echo through the streets of Milan. The Swiss issued from the town by a long and narrow causeway between two marshes, and advanced with lowered pikes upon the French artillery which they hoped to capture. But the pick of the men-at-arms were there, men and horses alike clothed in steel. Thirty charges were delivered upon this "crowd of peasants" without checking its advance; effective artillery fire mowed down whole columns, but the main body still moved forward unshaken. Three times the Swiss carried the first batteries, around which a "battle of giants" raged. The constable, princes, and lords were as reckless of their lives as "maddened boars"; the king himself charged at the head of his personal guards and was struck many times. Night came, but the battle continued by moonlight, until complete darkness fell. The French and Swiss armies were mingled with each other and so remained waiting for the morning. The king slept on a gun-carriage a few paces from the enemy; Bayard strayed into the midst of the Swiss and was obliged to crawl on his hands and knees in order to regain his own men without being discovered. At daybreak the battle was renewed, but between nine and ten in the morning the Swiss heard shouts of "Marco! Marco!" behind them raised by the advance-guard of the Venetian army which was hastening up to take part in the battle. "The conquerors of princes" formed in good order and recrossed their mountains without opposition.

The Battle of Marignano was a brilliant opening for the reign

of Francis, and the joy of the French army was extreme. The young king determined to do honour to the hero of the Brescia and of Guinegate, and caused Bayard to knight him on the field of battle. The chevalier carried out all the rites of the ancient ceremony, and having given the accolade to the king, sprang up, kissing his sword and crying, "Truly, my good sword, from this day you will be a cherished relic, since you have now given the order of knighthood to so virtuous and powerful a king, and I will bear you no more save against Turks and Saracens and Moors."

Perpetual Peace with the Swiss (1516).—Italy lay at the mercy of Francis I.; he used his victory with moderation. Without attempting the conquest of Naples, he employed himself in securing the strong places in the north of the peninsula. The Doge of Genoa surrendered that city to him, and he himself laid siege to the citadel of Milan, which Navarro promised he should enter within a month. Maximilian Sforza did not wait to be driven from his castle; he resigned his duchy in exchange for an annual pension. The emperor was obliged to cede Verona to Venice; the King of England consented to sell Tournai, St. Amand, and Mortagne back to France. Finally, a satisfactory peace closed Italy to the Swiss, and in the following year the confederacy, renewing the treaty which they had made with Louis XI. in 1474, undertook, in return for an annual subsidy of 700,000 crowns, to permit the king to levy troops among the cantons whenever he had need. This treaty, the so-called "Perpetual Peace," lasted as long as the French monarchy.

Concordat with Leo X. (1516).—The pope, head of the league and of the house of Medici, arrived at Bologna to hear the terms of the conqueror. He anticipated that he would be obliged to make great sacrifices in Italy, but Francis preferred to increase his power in his own kingdom. He granted to the Medici the possession of Florence and sacrified to the pope the Pragmatic Sanction of Charles VII. But he replaced that treaty by a concordat which placed the clergy of France under his control. Leo X. retained the right of appeal to Rome in greater cases, with the proviso that the judges commissioned by him should be Frenchmen. He abandoned the right of reservation and of expectant graces, by means of which the holy see had secured the nomination to a number of benefices; he recognised the right of the king to dispose personally of ecclesiastical dignities, preserving only the privilege of refusing spiritual investiture in event of the nominee being guilty of some canonical offence.

Francis repudiated the doctrine of the fathers of Basle as to the superiority of general councils over the papacy and re-established the tax of *annates*, by which all clergy promoted to an important benefice were compelled to pay a year's revenue to the holy see. Both parties thus disposed of that which did not belong to them according to the common law of the realm; in the division of the spoils of the Gallican Church, says Mézeray (with some exaggeration of the terms of the concordat), the pope took the temporal *annates*, and the king the spiritual nomination to bishoprics. The clergy, the universities, and the law courts protested against the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction, which impaired the prerogatives both of corporations and of individuals, and the parliament of Paris refused to register the concordat. But it was difficult to resist a young and victorious prince successfully. "They shall see," cried Francis, "that in France there is a king and not a Venetian oligarchy." After resisting for two years, the parliament, "by express command of the king," registered the concordat, and its only consolation was that, in practice, it remained faithful to the spirit which had inspired the national council of Bourges. The concordat consecrated an important increase of royal power, for it placed the clergy in dependence on the king, as the nobles had been since the time of Louis XI., as the bourgeoisie had always been.

The Court of Francis I.—During his stay in Italy, Francis I. was impressed by the wonderful results of the Renaissance, and he determined to introduce the new art into France as his most valuable conquest. He persuaded many great Italian artists to follow him across the mountains and bought from others their chief masterpieces. The consideration which the youthful conqueror displayed for the intellectual leaders of mankind had more weight with them that the gold he gave them. The story that Leonardo da Vinci died in his arms is unhappily false, but it is true that the king called the artist his father, that he accorded royal honours to a painting of Raphael, that he delighted in all things intellectual, and that the sage, the poet, and the artist, whom he treated as men useful to the state, never found themselves out of place in that brilliant court which surrounded him.

The court of France, which has exerted upon public morals, upon literature, upon the national spirit, and even upon foreign nations so enduring and too often so pernicious an influence, dates from Francis I. Before his time it did not exist. The sober councillors who surrounded Louis XII. and Anne of Brittany permitted only restrained and infrequent fêtes. Francis I. liked

always to be followed by so numerous a court that it was computed there were rarely less than six thousand and sometimes more than eighteen thousand horses around the royal residence. The nobles came there only to practise the art of obedience under the eye of their master. Francis laid down that a court without ladies was a year without spring time, a summer without roses, and by the reputation of his fêtes he drew thither those noble ladies who had hitherto remained hidden in the recesses of their feudal manors. "At first," as Mézeray justly remarks, "this had most excellent results, since the fair sex introduced polite and courteous manners into the court, and instilled generosity of a high standard into well-trained minds. But manners were soon corrupted. Offices and rewards were distributed according to the caprice of women, and the ladies of the court caused the adoption of most pernicious maxims of government." Three women especially exercised a disastrous influence on the court during the reign of Francis; his own mother, Louise of Savoy, the Countess of Châteaubriant, sister of Lautrec, and the Duchess of Étampes, who, that she might injure the dauphin with his father, revealed state secrets to the enemies of France.

Treaty of Noyon with Charles of Austria (1516).—Until 1519 France and Europe remained at peace. In 1516 Ferdinand the Catholic died, and his death gave Aragon, Navarre, Naples, Sicily, and Sardinia to Charles of Austria, who was already sovereign of the Low Countries and of Castille. Francis made no attempt to prevent his accession to this magnificent inheritance. He signed with him the Treaty of Noyon (1516), which concluded an offensive and defensive alliance between the two princes, securing no other advantage for France than the restoration of Navarre to Jeanne d'Albret, of which she had been deprived by Ferdinand the Catholic. A second death, that of Maximilian, changed the whole situation (1519).

Francis I. becomes a Candidate for the Imperial Crown: Election and Power of Charles V. (1519).—In the death of Maximilian, Francis saw a vista of new grandeur; he aspired to revive the empire of Charlemagne and believed that he had only to demand the imperial crown in order to secure it. Germany needed an able prince to defend her against the Turks, whose power then resembled some raging flood, threatening alternately the shores of Europe and those of Asia. It might seem that no one was better able to arrest this torrent than the young victor of Marignano. But the German princes realised the position to which the Kings of France had reduced their nobles and they

feared a like fate. The Archbishop of Mainz declared aloud at the time of the election, "Every one to-day trembles at the least sign of a king." It appeared that there was nothing to be feared from the young King of Spain, a ruler without glory, whose lands were extensive but scattered, and who, as master of Austria, would be obliged to receive the first onslaught of the Turks if they turned against Germany. Henry VIII. of England was also among the candidates. His island kingdom was far away; his candidature was hardly serious. "Pounds sterling," says a contemporary, "are no better than gold crowns marked with a sun" (the standard French money). All the candidates had liberally distributed gold among the electors—the bills of receipt still exist—but though Francis gave most, Charles of Austria was elected and became the Emperor Charles V. Two centuries of warfare resulted from this simoniacal election.

Francis I. had written in a most chivalrous spirit to Charles V. before the election; he declared that they both wooed the same mistress and would remain good friends whichever might prove to be the fortunate aspirant. His defeat weighed upon him. Not only was his ambition wounded, but he saw the dangers which threatened France and Europe from the union of so many crowns on one head. From this moment, the policy of France changed. It was no longer directed to win a province beyond the Alps, to acquire some useless appanage for a cadet of the royal house; it aimed at saving the menaced liberty of the continent. Master of Spain and Naples, of the Low Countries and Austria, Charles V. might be said to hold Europe by the four corners. He was in addition emperor, a position which carried with it the suzerainty of Italy; he soon formed an alliance with the pope and with Henry VIII. of England, while Fernando Cortes and Pizarro conquered Mexico and Peru for him. One obstacle alone stood in the path of the new Charlemagne, whose motto was "Ever farther!" that obstacle was France, threatened by him already on three sides—by the Pyrenees, by Franche-Comté, and by Flanders; France who would not consent to submit to him or to be subdued.

It is the glory of Francis I. that he accepted this apparently unequal struggle with the house of Austria. He relied upon his courage and renown; he believed that a strong and obedient state, a compact kingdom, a martial people, wealthy and devoted, would enable him to prevail against a high-sounding list of divided and disaffected states, against this empire "upon which the sun never sets," "this great vessel, of which the

bow was in the Atlantic Ocean and the stern in the Indian Sea."

Negotiations with England (1520).—The two rivals contended for the alliance of Henry VIII., King of England, the only sovereign of importance besides themselves. Francis offered him splendid fêtes, the Field of the Cloth of Gold, between Guines and Ardres (June, 1520). There he wasted his treasure in pompous frivolity and forced his courtiers to ruin themselves with him. "Many lords," says Martin du Bellay, "bore thither on their shoulders their mills, their forests, and their parks." A building of the period, the Hôtel du Bourg-Théroude at Rouen, still displays to us in curious bas-reliefs the stately cavalcades and the various incidents of this famous interview. Francis surpassed his guest in magnificence, in his address, and in the rare elegance of his conduct and manners. He offended the self-esteem of the English king in place of winning him over. Charles V. was more adroit; he sought out Henry VIII. at Gravelines and, himself shabbily dressed like a suitor, saluted him as his father, pensioned his favourite minister Cardinal Wolsey, to whom he promised the papal tiara, and thus secured for himself the English alliance.

French Invasion of Navarre: Imperialist Invasion of Champagne (1521).—Defeated in diplomacy, Francis hoped to be more fortunate in war. A revolt began in Spain; he ordered the invasion of Navarre, which Charles V., despite his promises, had not restored to Henry d'Albret, by an army which was ostensibly only in the pay of that prince (1521). Lesparre was in command; he captured Pampeluna, where a young Basque noble, Ignatius Loyola, was wounded; he was led by his wounds to renounce the profession of arms and he afterwards founded the order of the Jesuits. At the same time Robert de la Marck, Duke of Bouillon, with the secret support of France, declared war upon the emperor and attacked Luxemburg. But the Spanish rebels were crushed before the arrival of the French, who were then easily expelled from Navarre. In the north, the Count of Nassau, general of Charles V., overran the duchy of Bouillon, invaded Champagne, took Mouzon, and advanced upon Mézières. It was proposed to burn that town to prevent it from being left to the enemy. "It is not a weak place," cried Bayard, "for men of courage are found there," and he threw himself into the town. The imperialists summoned him to surrender. "I need a bridge by which to march out," he answered, "and your bodies have not yet filled the ditch." In two days the

enemy fired five thousand bullets into the town, and at this siege bombs and mortars such as have been employed in modern times were used for the first time. A thousand terrified soldiers fled. "So much the better," said Bayard, "such *canaille* ought not to share our glory." After three weeks the enemy abandoned his efforts. Bayard had saved France from an invasion which no army was available to check.

Battle of La Bicocca: Loss of Milan (1522).—The invasion of Champagne was immediately followed by open war between France and the emperor. The first important blow was struck in Italy. Lautrec, who commanded in the province of Milan, had offended the inhabitants by his harsh and rapacious government. As his forces were inferior to the Spanish troops of Pescara, he abandoned Parma, Piacenza, and Milan itself (1521). He had difficulty in keeping the Swiss with him, because he was unable to pay them. For though Francis had promised him 400,000 crowns for this purpose, the Duchess of Angoulême, jealous of the Countess of Chateaubriant, Lautrec's sister and the king's mistress, had induced the intendant Samblancay to hand over the money to her. The Swiss, weary of waiting for their pay, demanded money, dismissal, or battle; Lautrec led them to the attack at the Bicocca, seven miles from Milan (April 22). They made a resolute advance along a narrow road in order to carry the position, and delivered three attacks; decimated by artillery fire, they fell back and retired into their mountains. As a result of their retreat, Milan was abandoned to the Spanish troops, and Lautrec on his return complained bitterly because he had not received the promised money. The superintendent, from whom the queen had secured a receipt for the sum, could not justify his conduct, and five years later he was hanged.

Treason of Bourbon (1523).—Francis fancied that he would restore affairs by his personal intervention. He directed 25,000 men towards the Alps, but at the moment when he was about to take command, a plot was revealed of which the success would have ruined France. Charles V., assured of the support of the new pope, his former tutor, Adrian VI., and of that of the King of England, who had promised to effect a landing in Picardy, had secured a powerful ally in the very heart of France. Master of La Marche, Bourbonnais, Auvergne, Forez, and Beaujolais, the Constable Bourbon occupied the position of a prince. An able general, proud and adventurous in disposition, devoured by ambition, and with his eyes already on the throne, he was irritated by the petty intrigues and discontented with

the extent of feminine influence in the court of France. Louise of Savoy had designed to marry him and to share in his vast inheritance; sustaining a repulse, she became his implacable enemy and schemed with the Chancellor Duprat to overthrow a will by which the constable held half his possessions. Bourbon lost the case. Charles V. had carefully watched the progress of the affair; he now offered Bourbon, over and above all that he already held, Dauphiné, Provence, and Lyonnais, which were to be erected into a kingdom, as the price of his desertion of Francis. Henry VIII. at the same time urged his claim to the western provinces, while the emperor demanded Burgundy and the Somme towns. A plan for the dismemberment of France was thus formed. A papal bull released the French from their oath of fealty. The last representative of mediaeval feudalism, Bourbon thought that he could act as the former Dukes of Brittany and Burgundy had done; he forgot that there was now a France which was resolved to remain one and that treason towards the king was treason towards her.

Francis visited him in his castle of Moulins, hoping to secure from him an avowal of his intended treason, repentance, an oath of friendship, and subsequent devotion, but Bourbon remained cold and unmoved. No sooner had Francis left him than he fled along a circuitous route and took refuge in Germany.

Triple Invasion of France (1523).—As the constable might have left accomplices behind him, the king was unwilling to leave the kingdom, the less so as a triple invasion, designed to assist Bourbon and the districts which he had promised to raise in revolt, now took place. Francis sent Lautrec into Guienne against 25,000 Spaniards who vainly attacked Bayonne; Count Claude of Guise was despatched against 12,000 German landsknechts who had entered France on the side of Franche-Comté and Champagne and who were driven back over the Meuse; and finally, the aged La Trémoille was sent against 35,000 English or Flemings, who advanced within eleven leagues of Paris, but whom he checked and then compelled to retreat by his able manœuvres, despite the fact that he had a mere handful of soldiers.

Death of Bayard (1524).—Fortunate in France because he had chosen his lieutenants well, the king suffered disaster in Italy. He had sent his best army there, 40,000 strong, under Admiral Bonnivet, an accomplished and brilliant courtier, a brave man, but an inferior general. In place of advancing at once upon Milan, which was undefended, and taking it, Bonni-

vet gave the enemy time to fortify it and allowed Lannoy, Viceroy of Naples, and Bourbon to effect a junction. He fell back along the Biagrasso upon Ticinella, left Bayard unsupported at Rebecco, and being compelled to retreat still farther in order to preserve his communications with France, he retired to the line of the Sesia, being wounded at Romagnano during his passage of this river. Bayard, whom he had left to protect the rear-guard, received a musket shot in the stomach. As the French retreated towards the Alps, Bourbon recognised the chevalier lying at the foot of a tree, his face toward the enemy, and expressed to him his grief at seeing him in such a state. "I have no need of pity," answered Bayard, "for I die as a brave man; but I pity you, since you are serving against your prince, your country, and your oath." Posterity has agreed with Bayard.

First Invasion of Provence (1524).—This defeat and the death of Bayard left the French frontier exposed to attack, and Bourbon, eager to stifle his remorse by winning some great success, crossed it. All Provence lay open to him, except Marseilles, which he found to be well fortified. He felt assured that three cannon shot would suffice to astonish the good burghers to such an extent that they would come with halters round their necks to the feet of the emperor. But Marseilles received him vigorously; the very women laboured to strengthen the wall, and the counter-mines on the side which was attacked were known as the "ladies' trench." Bourbon allowed forty days for this siege, but in his rear and on his right flank the furious peasants took up arms and hastily descended from the mountains to capture his convoys and cut off stragglers. Francis approached in person with 8000 cavalry, 34,000 infantry, and a strong force of artillery. He succeeded in closing one end of the *cul-de-sac* into which Bourbon had advanced, and the imperialist army, becoming demoralised, retreated towards the Alps (August, 1524).

Battle of Pavia (1525).—The King of France found himself in a position to appear once more upon the scene of his earliest exploits, and he was unable to resist this temptation. No enemy opposed him. At Rome the wits posted a notice offering a reward for the discovery of an imperialist army lost in the Alps. Francis captured Milan without striking a blow, and considered himself able with impunity to detach a force of 10,000 men for the conquest of the kingdom of Naples, while he himself pressed the siege of Pavia.

This imprudent action, which the king had refrained from

committing after his victory at Marignano, led to a serious disaster. Bourbon, animated by hatred, discovered unexpected resources; he turned everything into money and went to Germany. At the end of a few weeks he returned with 12,000 landsknechts. He formed a junction with Pescara and Lannoy, Viceroy of Naples, and the three together moved upon Pavia, placing Francis between them and the city, the garrison of which amounted to 6000 men, commanded by the resolute Antonio de Leyva. The position was critical; the older generals, Tavannes, Lautrec, and La Trémoille, advised the raising of the siege and the selection of another field of battle. Bonnivet asserted that the king must not retreat before a traitor, and Francis found this reason sufficient to induce him to hold his ground. In this battle (February 24, 1525), the French artillery accomplished marvels: "Genouillac tore gap after gap in the enemy's ranks; arms and heads flew about." But when the enemy began to waver under this murderous fire, the king fancied that the day was won; he threw himself upon them at the head of his men-at-arms and thus masked his artillery, rendering it useless. The Spanish infantry profited by this mistake; they fell upon the Swiss, who took to flight when they saw Antonio de Leyva advancing from the fortress against their rear, and the French men-at-arms found themselves alone on the field of battle. La Palice, La Trémoille, and all the best generals fell round the king. Bonnivet, the author of the disaster, had an opportunity to escape, but he remained to be killed. The king, himself wounded and surrounded by corpses, fought on for a long time. He refused to surrender to the traitor Bourbon. A French gentleman, Pompéran, recognising him, drew him from the mêlée and conducted him to the Viceroy of Naples, who received his sword on bended knee. "I hope," said Francis, "that I shall be treated as a king," and demanded that he should be sent to Madrid to his cousin the emperor. That evening he wrote to his mother a long letter, in which he said, "I would have you know my misfortune, for of all my belongings I have nothing left except my honour and my life which is safe." France turned this passage into a briefer and more heroic message, "All is lost save honour."

Regency of Louise of Savoy: Alliance with England.—France was not lost though her king was a prisoner. After the Battle of Poitiers and the capture of King John, she had experienced incalculable evils, but then the enemy were in the heart of the country and national unity had hardly been born. The defeat

of Pavia had been sustained on the banks of the Po; Italy alone suffered, pillaged as it was by the mercenaries who had gained the battle. The frontiers of France were not even attacked. Louise of Savoy, as regent, displayed a commendable and wise activity. She spent money freely in order to ransom prisoners and to reconstitute the body of men-at-arms. At the same time as she formed an army, she guarded against internal disorders, and abroad she entered into secret negotiations with Venice, the pope, and even with the Turkish sultan, Suleiman. The last she endeavoured to hurl against Austria, while she purchased the alliance of Henry VIII., who, alarmed at the growth of Charles V.'s power, caused a remarkable clause to be inserted in the treaty which he made, to the effect that the regent should not consent to the cession of any province. Henry realised that the integrity of France was the guarantee of the independence of Europe; he further did not desire any diminution of that which he was pleased to call his inheritance, for he still bore the title of King of France (August 30, 1525).

Captivity of the King: Treaty of Madrid (1526).—When Francis reached Madrid, he did not find Charles V. as magnanimous as he had expected. The emperor had affected to prohibit all celebration of the victory, on the ground that "no one should find cause for rejoicing in the misfortune of a king." But he none the less kept Francis captive and for long refused to see him. Sick with disappointment, scarcely consoled by the presence of his sister, Francis thought of abdicating in favour of his son, and of thus leaving in the hands of his rival only a brave knight in place of a King of France. But his resolution failed him. He consented to sign a disastrous treaty (January, 1526), after having entered a secret protest against the moral violence which, in his opinion, served to annul all the acts of a prisoner. He ceded Burgundy to Charles, but reserved the homage of that province; renounced his claims to Naples, Milan, Genoa, and the suzerainty of Flanders and Artois; restored the property of Bourbon, and promised to marry the emperor's sister, the queen-dowager of Portugal. Exchanged for his two sons on the banks of the Bidassoa, he spurred his horse on to French soil, crying, "I am again a king." An assembly of notables decided that the king was not capable of ceding the most important province of the kingdom. The deputies of the estates of Burgundy invoked the coronation oath, and declared that they would remain French despite king and emperor. Charles saw his plan frustrated; he accused Francis

of disloyalty; the king retorted that the emperor "lied in his throat," and suggested the settlement of the dispute by single combat.

The Holy League (1526): The Sack of Rome (1527).—Francis, still dumbfounded by the disaster of Pavia, did not renew the war with vigour. He carried on many negotiations, ratified all the acts of the regent, confirmed the treaties which she had concluded, continued the secret relations with the Porte, and signed with Pope Clement VII. (who released him from the oath which he had taken at Madrid), with the King of England, with Venice, Florence, and the Swiss a Holy League for the deliverance of Italy. That unhappy land, which had been the scene of war for thirty-two years, was at that time the prey of mercenary bands, which the generals obeyed rather than commanded. The Italians made an attempt to free themselves from these ferocious foreigners; an Italian army was assembled under the command of the Duke of Urbino. But the Constable Bourbon descended from the Alps at the head of a new force of ten or fifteen thousand fanatical and booty-loving Lutherans. One of them, George Frondsberg, wore round his neck a chain of gold with which, he said, he hoped to strangle the pope. In place of checking the advance of this new terror, the Duke of Urbino followed cautiously at a distance, concealing his trepidation by comparing himself to Fabius Cunctator. Charles V., who was not unwilling to read Italy a lesson, left Bourbon without orders. The constable was no longer master of his men. When they had devastated the Milanese, the mercenaries demanded some new prey, Florence or Rome, preferably the latter, "the sacrilegious Babylon." Bourbon gave way to them, forming great designs in his mind, and perhaps aspiring to the kingdom of Italy. But he was the first to fall in the assault on the walls of Rome. His soldiers, who were devoted to him, avenged him cruelly, and for nine months Rome suffered tortures and outrages such as neither the Goths nor the Vandals had ever inflicted upon her. It was the army of Charles V. which profaned the capital of Christendom and held the pope prisoner in the castle of St. Angelo. It is true that the emperor, in order to conceal the part which he had in this great scandal, caused masses to be said for the deliverance of the Holy Father, but the brigands only ceased to pillage after they had been decimated by plague.

Second War with Charles V. (1527–1529): Expedition of Lautrec to Naples (1528).—The King of France accused Charles

V. as the author of those horrors from which he profited while condemning them. Francis might well have reproached himself since he had broken his word to his allies. While the imperialists were sacking Rome, he assembled a meeting of notables at Paris, the only one which he called, and having brought many charges against his rival, secured two million gold crowns for the ransom of his sons. Meanwhile he despatched Lautrec into Lombardy, with orders to penetrate to the extremity of the peninsula and to effect the conquest of the kingdom of Naples, of which the possession was so valueless to France. Lautrec at first gained some brilliant successes, and secured almost the whole kingdom. But he was left without money; he offended Doria, the Genoese admiral, who deserted him; pestilence followed, carried off the general and discouraged the army; the expedition was ruined. This was the fourth French army which Italy had devoured since the Battle of La Bicocca. Another, under St. Pol, was destroyed in the spring of the following year at Landriano in Lombardy. The peninsula remained in the power of Charles V., and for nearly three and a half centuries it suffered from the influence of the house of Austria.

Treaty of Cambrai (1529).—It appeared probable that Charles V. would succeed in subduing France. But a war of religion was on the point of breaking out in Germany; Suleiman, the secret ally of Francis I., led his formidable janissaries to the walls of Vienna, and the King of England threatened to abandon the Austrian alliance by repudiating his first wife, Catherine of Aragon, the aunt of Charles. The emperor, finding that two fresh wars were about to ensue upon his triumphs of Pavia and Landriano, wished to secure the peace of the west while he was occupied so fully in the east and north. Louise of Savoy and Charles's aunt, Margaret of Austria, met in the town of Cambrai and there concluded the "Peace of Dames." Charles, who kept Naples and was about to be crowned King of Lombardy, renounced his claim to the province of Burgundy, but maintained all the other terms of the Treaty of Madrid: a ransom of two million gold crowns, the cession of Hesdin, Tournai, the suzerainty of Flanders and Artois, and the abandonment of all French claims to Italy.

Six Years' Peace (1529–1535): Alliance with the Turks and with the German Protestants.—The suspension of hostilities effected by the Treaty of Cambrai lasted until the end of 1535. Charles and Francis profited from this, but in different ways. Having regulated as its master the affairs of Italy, and having

protected Vienna and Germany against the Turks, the emperor took the offensive against them. He gathered in the ports of Spain and Italy five hundred ships, manned by 30,000 men, and led them against Tunis, a pirate stronghold then ruled by a man of genius, Haireddin Barbarossa, Suleiman's admiral. The fort of Goletta was taken; Barbarossa was put to flight; 20,000 Christian captives were freed; and Tunis was restored to its former ruler who recognised the suzerainty of Charles V. (1535).

Francis I. abandoned himself to the extravagant enjoyment of peace, though without neglecting entirely the counsels of prudence. That he might no longer be at the mercy of Swiss and German mercenaries, he organised a national infantry, which amounted to 42,000 men. He renewed his alliance with Henry VIII., who was on the point of breaking finally with the holy see (1532), and at the same time he recovered the favour of the pope by seeking for the young prince, afterwards Henry II., the hand of Catherine de Medici, the pontiff's niece. Clement VII. died soon afterwards, but papal policy continued to tend towards alliance with France since the house of Austria held Naples. Francis further revived the old connection with Scotland, whose king married first Francis' eldest daughter and then Marie of Lorraine. He later signed the first treaties between France and Denmark (1541) and Sweden (1542). He thus attempted to establish beyond the frontiers of France a coalition of secondary states, in order to hold in check the aspirant to universal dominion. In 1534, he ceased to attempt to conceal his relations with the Porte, remarking that when wolves fell upon his flock, it was necessary to call in the help of dogs. He demanded the friendship of Suleiman by an embassy which was received with great honour at Constantinople. The sultan promised to assist his friend, "the padishah of France," with all his power, in case of need, and a commercial convention concluded between the two monarchs was in reality an offensive and defensive alliance. The German Protestants, who had formed the League of Schmalkalde against the emperor, also received overtures from Francis (1532). But these two alliances placed him in a difficult position; the "most Christian king" could not ally with the Turks without great scandal, and yet the alliance was necessary to him. The "eldest son of the Church" could not give the hand of fellowship to the reformers who were tearing the Church to pieces, and yet it was important for him to have friends within the empire and to increase the embarrassments of his mighty rival in his own lands.

Francis did not hesitate to abandon religious in favour of political interests; such abandonment was inevitable since national interests were born with the centralised modern states.

The Reformation.—The Reformation and the consequent schism in the Church resulted from that irresistible movement which in the sixteenth century led the human mind to break through those barriers by which its activity had hitherto been circumscribed. The revival of classical learning opened new fields for thought. While Christopher Columbus and Vasco da Gama discovered new worlds and opened new spheres for the exercise of man's physical energy, Copernicus discovered the true laws of the universe and presented them for the speculation of mankind. It is no matter for surprise that an age which saw such great achievements of human daring and of the human intellect, should fall under the dominion of the mighty power of thought. Amazed at all these novelties, the world began to doubt all things old. A spirit of curiosity and criticism ranged everywhere; it transformed the arts, literature, and social conditions. It aspired to transform also the institutions of religion, which, on the evidence of the last of the Fathers of the Church, groaned under a weight of abuses. During the fifteenth century the Councils of Constance and Basle had in vain attempted to correct the discipline and manners of the clergy; in vain Cardinal Julian had said to Eugenius IV., "I see the axe laid to the root, the tree bent, and instead of supporting it while it is yet possible, we hurl it to the ground." The Church had refused to reform herself, but before eighty years had passed a revolution had torn half of Europe from her.

It was at the end of the year 1517 that Luther began his struggle with Rome; in 1520, the rupture was complete. In 1525 the Elector of Saxony, the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, the Dukes of Mecklenburg, Pomerania, and Zell, and a large number of imperial cities had accepted the ideas of the reformer, and, a momentous event, the grand master of the Teutonic Order had secularised Prussia, one of the greatest domains of the Church, and declared himself an hereditary duke.

Beginning of the Reformation in France.—The new ideas spread early to France, where they made their first conquests among the literary class. All the great French lawyers of this period accepted the Reformation either secretly or avowedly. A party in the court itself inclined towards it. Louise of Savoy appeared to be hardly opposed to it; her beautiful and accomplished daughter, Margaret, Queen of Navarre, the author of

"mysteries" and "novels," openly professed the principles of the German reformers, and the Duchess of Étampes, the king's mistress, piqued herself on protecting them. Lefebvre of Étaples, Louis Berquin, savants known and esteemed by Francis, wrote theses in support of them. The former put forward Protestant ideas six years before Luther. Finally, the court poet, Clement Marot, abandoned his elegies and epigrams in order to translate the psalms of David, which the Parisian reformers chanted at *Le Pré aux Clercs*. Francis, far from being alarmed by these manifestations, tried to attach to himself Erasmus of Rotterdam, the king of erudition and of literature in this period, who was accused of having prepared the way for Luther by his attacks on the monks. But when the German peasants, drawing social theories from the new doctrines, attempted the overthrow of all authority, Francis considered that the Reformation, which had been a revolt against the papacy, might easily become, in politics, a revolt against royal authority. Although he continued from self-interest to be the friend of the German Protestants, he was unwilling that their ideas should take root in his own territories.

First Persecutions of the Protestants.—During the captivity of the king, two Lutherans had been burned in the capital. Francis had stopped these executions, but in 1528 a statue of the Virgin was mutilated in Paris. Francis declared that "if he found one of his members infected by this doctrine he would cut it off for fear that the rest of his body might become corrupt," and from that day he caused the reformers to be persecuted. Berquin, who refused to recant, was burned on the Place Maubert (1529); at Vienne, Seez, Toulouse there were other executions. The necessity for keeping on good terms with the German Protestants modified the persecutions, but in 1536 six wretches were cruelly executed in different parts of Paris in the presence of the whole court.

Third War between Francis and Charles V. (1536–1538).—Peace was interrupted by a crime on the part of the emperor. Francis had a secret agent at Milan; at the instance of Charles V. this agent was taken and put to death in a dungeon by Duke Francesco Sforza (1533). The duke died shortly afterwards, leaving no heir; Francis at once renewed his pretensions to Milan, and at the beginning of 1536 he invaded Savoy and Piedmont, the dominions of the "porter of the Alps," who since 1494 had opened those mountains to the French, but who now, as the brother-in-law of Charles V., wished to keep them closed.

The emperor returned at this moment from his glorious expedition to Tunis. At the news of this aggression, he abandoned all restraint and at Rome, in full consistory, before the cardinals and the ambassadors of Christendom, he accused Francis of turbulent ambition and impiety, on the ground of his alliance with the unbelievers; he swore that he would make him the poorest gentleman in his kingdom. "If I have no more resources than the King of France," he added, "I will go with hands bound and a halter round my neck and throw myself at the feet of my adversary to implore his pardon."

Second Invasion of Provence (1536).—The invasion which Charles then attempted in Provence was no more successful than the earlier effort, though he had already commissioned the historian Paul Jovius to write the account of his victories. "How many days' journey is it to Paris?" said the emperor to a French captain who had valiantly defended Fossano. "If your majesty," was the answer, "means by days of battle, it would be at least twelve, unless the aggressor's head were broken in the first engagement." It did not require even one of the days of which the brave captain had spoken to check the 50,000 men of Charles V. The Constable Montmorency, reviving a tactical plan of the days of barbarism, destroyed the villages and open towns, granaries, mills, and supplies of food. He created a desert in front of the imperial army and entrenched himself in a strong position before Avignon. The enemy advanced in sight of Aix and Marseilles, but found themselves enclosed between these two places (both of which were strongly guarded), the sea, the Durance, and the Alps, in a wasted country, in the midst of a hostile population, who intercepted convoys and cut off stragglers. Decimated by hunger and dysentery the imperialists retreated, and the emperor "buried in Spain his honour which had died in France." This expedition gave the second but not the final proof that France is impregnable on this side.

The Provençals had behaved admirably; the people of Picardy did equally well against the Count of Nassau. At St. Riquier and Peronne, women fought on the ramparts side by side with men. It was not at first proposed to defend Peronne, but d'Estourmel, a brave gentleman of the suburbs, threw himself into it, bringing with him his wife, children, servants, and all the provisions in his granaries, and so revived the courage of the inhabitants that the imperialists were forced to retreat. The Normans did not see the enemy in their midst, but they went

to seek him, and their corsairs took prizes to the value of 200,000 crowns of gold from the Spaniards.

Truce of Nice (1538).—The two adversaries, after having once more engaged in close combat, found that each was invulnerable on his own ground. Charles had been checked in France; Francis met with no success either in the Low Countries or in Italy. The pope, alarmed at the progress of the Turks, who were sacking the coast of Otranto, intervened and caused the Truce of Nice to be signed, which was to last for ten years. Francis preserved Hesdin, Savoy, and Piedmont, and his position was thus better than it had been after the Treaty of Cambrai (1538).

Charles V. in France (1539).—For a moment it appeared possible that from irreconcilable enemies, the two sovereigns would become devoted friends. They had an interview at Aigues-Mortes, where in their confidential discussions they addressed one another by the titles of cousin and brother. Some time afterwards, the city of Ghent, weary of the weight of taxation, rebelled against Charles V. and offered to hand itself over to his rival. Francis, not content with making this proposal known to his new friend, persuaded him to pass through France in order to be able to crush the rebels the sooner. The emperor accepted the invitation, was magnificently received and fêted in the midst of that France which he had wished to dismember. Francis went to meet him as far as Chatellerault; he hoped to conquer his politic friend by his generosity and to secure Milan by his favour. Allusions and requests were not spared. One day one of the king's young sons sprang on the back of the emperor's horse, crying, "Sire, you are my prisoner." In the midst of a dinner, which the Duchess of Étampes adorned, Francis suddenly remarked to the emperor, "You see this fair lady? Well, she urges me to keep you in ward." "If the advice is good," replied Charles, "follow it." But that evening he took care not to receive back at the fair hands of the duchess a bag which he had allowed to fall as if by accident. He reached Flanders without his journey having cost him anything except vague promises. The king had counted on receiving the investiture of Milan for one of his sons, and was profoundly irritated at having been deceived by the emperor. An act of treachery of which Charles was guilty, the assassination of two French agents at the Porte, caused the renewal of war (1541).

Fourth War between Francis and Charles (1542–1544).—On this occasion the efforts of Francis and Suleiman were better concerted. The Turkish janissaries conquered almost the whole

of Hungary, while Francis overran Luxemburg and Piedmont with his armies. Some months earlier Charles had led a formidable armament against Algiers (October and November, 1541), but his fleet, attacked by a furious tempest, was almost entirely destroyed. The sea was freed ; the *fleurs-de-lis* and the crescent came together in the Mediterranean, and a Franco-Turkish squadron bombarded Nice, the only town left to the Duke of Savoy (1543).

Charles V. complained loudly of this treason to the Christian cause. "All my life," he would exclaim, "has been spent in soothing the discord in the Church and in saving Christendom from the Turks ; all the life of the King of France has been spent in supporting the arms of infidels and in perpetuating the troubles of the Church." To make an end of such opposition, he concluded a peace with the German Protestants and allied with the King of England. A new invasion of France from three sides was at once planned (1543). Del Guasto, Governor of Milan, at the head of the Spaniards, was to defeat the force of the Duke d'Enghien and invade Provence ; in the north, the emperor and Henry VIII. were to meet under the walls of Paris, the former advancing through Champagne, the latter through Picardy. Francis, since Pavia, had distrusted the issue of great battles and preferred to wear out his enemies ; this was the order given on all his frontiers. But Montluc was sent by Enghien, who was face to face with the Spaniards at Cérisoles, to ask leave to fight. Francis refused, but was persuaded by the confident assertions of Montluc. At the news that he was to give battle, more than a hundred young gentlemen of the first families hastened to Piedmont, bringing with them their courage and their money, which Enghien borrowed to pay his soldiers. The men-at-arms made several brilliant charges, but victory would not have been won without the old bands of French and Swiss infantry. The Spaniards lost 12,000 men, all their cannon, and their baggage ; Enghien remained master of Piedmont, but was unable to advance since part of his army was recalled to defend the north of France from invasion (April, 1544).

Siege of St. Dizier: Peace of Crespy (1544): Treaty with Henry VIII. (1546).—On this side the campaign began disastrously. Charles entered Champagne without opposition ; he took St. Dizier, which was ill fortified and in bad repair, yet held out for forty days. He also took Epernay and Chateau-Thierry, where he was checked by Claude of Guise at the foot of walls hardly completed. The Duchess of Étampes was accused

of having revealed to him the whole plan of defence. The dauphin was defeated at Meaux ; the Parisians in terror began to emigrate with their movable goods to Orleans. " God," cried Francis, " thou hast made me pay dearly for this crown which I supposed that I had received as a gift at thy hands." Fortunately for France, the King of England failed to observe the plan which had been arranged. He halted at the siege of Boulogne and Montreuil, leaving his ally isolated with a mercenary army without money or provisions after the adventurous dash which he had made across Champagne. The dauphin was already harassing the rear of the imperial army, and at the moment when Charles V. fancied that he had reduced his foe to the last extremity, he was obliged to sign the Peace of Crespy (September). The two monarchs mutually restored their recent conquests ; Francis remained master of Savoy and Piedmont, and secured Milan for his younger son. But the prince died, and the emperor hastened to invest his own son Philip with the duchy. Henry VIII. declined to adhere to this peace, and only consented to treat when a French fleet menaced the English coast. He retained Boulogne, but promised to return it in eight years on receipt of two million crowns. It was restored in 1550 for four hundred thousand crowns.

Massacre of the Vaudois (1545).—Francis was growing feeble. He was no longer the brilliant knight of Marignano or Pavia, the friend of Leonardo da Vinci and Erasmus. Prematurely aged by his excesses, he was at fifty a morose old man. The darkest blemish of his reign belongs to these unhappy years. While he was at war with Charles V., Francis conciliated the reformers, and the Edict of Coucy, in 1535, had even ordered the suspension of religious persecution. When peace had been concluded harsh and severe men, such as Montmorency and Cardinal Tournon, resumed the ascendancy in the council. After the Treaty of Crespy, they attributed the defeat of the king and his very illness to the relaxation of rigour against the Protestants. He allowed himself to be persuaded and resumed the persecution. At Meaux, forty fires were lit on one day (1546) ; but the most odious execution was that of a whole inoffensive people, the Vaudois, whose beliefs dated from three centuries back.

In 1540 they were condemned as heretics. A delay of execution was granted to the two little towns of Merindol and Cabrières and to some thirty villages of the Alps of Provence in favour of peaceable peasants who paid their taxes regularly and exhibited pure and simple manners. But in April, 1545, stern

and definite orders reached the parliament of Aix from the court. Baron de la Garde, assisted by President Oppedo and Guerin, the advocate-general, suddenly entered the land of these unhappy men with their soldiers; three thousand were massacred or burned in their houses; six hundred and sixty were sent to the galleys; and the remainder were dispersed in the woods and mountains where the majority died of hunger and misery. Not a house or tree remained in a circumference of fifteen leagues.

Death of the King (1547).—Francis I., though he may not have known all the details, approved what was done and ordered the persecution to continue. Foreign affairs were no better. This was the period during which Charles V., freed from the war with France and assured of peace with the Turks, turned his forces against German Protestants and, under the cloak of destroying heresy, attempted to destroy German liberty. The Battle of Mühlberg appeared to place the empire at his feet. Francis did not live to see this great success of his rival; he had died three weeks before, at the château of Rambouillet, at the age of fifty-two (March, 1547).

He was, in his good and his bad points alike, a remarkable king. He was characterised by those brilliant defects for which France has always had too much leniency. His gallantry bordered on debauchery, his magnificence on profusion, his courage on rashness. He was violent, capricious, the prey of unworthy favourites; on occasion he was even unjust and perfidious, and he was always arbitrary in his conduct. But he sometimes showed a real greatness, as when, before the massacre of the Vaudois, he pardoned the rebel Rochelais, "not wishing," as he said, "to have, like the emperor, the blood of his subjects on his hands." He loved intellectual things; he had artistic tastes, and, despite his despotism and his faults, his name will always be honourably associated with a great era in modern civilisation.

Foundation of Havre de Grace and Vitry-le-Français (1517, 1545).—Two French towns, Le Havre and Vitry-le-Français, date from the reign of Francis I. France had only two small ports at the mouth of the Seine, Honfleur on the left bank, Harfleur on the right. The latter began to disappear under the sands, and Francis, who aspired to have a great naval establishment on the Channel, ordered a better site to be found in the neighbourhood. Some short distance away a village, inhabited by fishermen, was found, consisting only of a large dyke in the

midst of a marsh and a small chapel dedicated to Notre-Dame de la Grace. But the place faced the open sea, beyond the mouth of the Seine, out of reach of those moving sands which modern skill alone has been able to overcome. It possessed also an advantage unique in the ports of this coast: high tide lasted for three hours in the outer port, while in the very neighbourhood it began to fall as soon as it had ceased to rise. Two towers had defended the place in the time of Charles VII., and Louis XI. had begun the construction of a wooden quay. In 1517, Chillon, vice-admiral of France, laid the first stone of that new city, the situation of which was so well chosen and which became the chief French commercial port on the Atlantic. It was named Franciscopolis, but this Greco-Latin name was too learned for the poor fishermen, who, faithful to their patroness, continued to call their town Le Havre de Grace. But the memory of Francis I. remains there, the round tower which defends the entrance to the port bearing his name.

When Charles V. invaded Champagne in 1544, he took and razed Vitry in Perthois. Francis I., instead of restoring this small town, which was dominated by the neighbouring heights and incapable of defence, forced the inhabitants to settle some distance away in a fertile plain on the banks of the Marne. The new city became Vitry-le-Français, or Le François, but less fortunate than Le Havre, it never attained any importance and has no monument of interest, except its cathedral, which affords an example rather of the Perpendicular than of the Renaissance style of architecture.

CHAPTER XL

HENRY II. (1547–1559)

Accession of Henry II.: Ascendancy of Montmorency and the Guises.—Henry II. exaggerated his father's faults and possessed none of his good qualities. He had neither spirit nor grace; his build was heavy, his intellect dull. He took pleasure only in physical exercise, and this he loved so well that he died while engaged in it. Despite her forty-eight years, Diana of Poitiers, by her wit and by a beauty which defied the ravages of time, exercised an influence over him which her amazed contemporaries attributed to an enchanted ring. He created her Duchess of Valentinois and allowed her to rule the court, in which the queen

lived without credit. The chief administration was placed in the hands of the Constable Montmorency, of Marshal St. André, the king's favourite, and of the family of the Guises, a younger branch of the ducal house of Lorraine, poor in goods, but rich in ambition. For the present they only declared themselves to be the heirs of the house of Anjou; later, they posed as the descendants of Charlemagne. The reign opened with a great distribution of offices, honours, and pensions. In three weeks the king dissipated 400,000 crowns which he had found in his father's coffers, collected for the war against Charles V. "The only gates to credit were those of Montmorency and Guise," says a contemporary. "Everything went to their nephews and clients; marshals' batons, governments of provinces, companies of men-at-arms, nothing escaped them . . . any more than flies escape the swallows; estates, dignities, bishoprics, abbeys, offices, and every other rich morsel they incontinently devoured, and for this purpose they kept in every part of the realm apostate and servile men to inform them if any holder of a salaried position or of a benefice should happen to die."

The new reign began by severities which supplied a tardy reparation for the worst deed of Francis I. A capital charge was laid against the murderers of the Vaudois, and thanks to various influences they were taken. One of them, Advocate-General Guerin, was hanged. The Sire de Vervins, who had surrendered Boulogne to the English in 1544 against the will of the inhabitants, was decapitated.

Revolt in Guienne (1548).—A bloody revolt raged in Guienne. Bands of from ten to fifteen thousand peasants rose against the salt tax, ranged over the province, murdered the *gabeleurs* (the collectors of the gabelle), defeated the men-at-arms sent against them, released prisoners, and burned the houses of the officers of justice. At Bordeaux, the governor's lieutenant was assassinated. Montmorency arrived with 10,000 men; he determined to force an entrance, though no resistance was offered, caused more than a hundred persons to be executed, and compelled the magistrates "to disinter a murdered official with their nails" that he might be accorded a magnificent funeral. The salt tax was reduced in the province which had objected to it, from fear that the district would otherwise call in the English. But Bordeaux lost its privileges and its parliament, which were not restored to it until 1550.

Alliance with Scotland and with the German Protestants: Edict of Chateaubriant (1551).—The influence of Francis, Duke

of Guise, and of his brother Charles, Archbishop of Reims, undoubtedly caused the most useful employment of the resources of France during this reign and had the most salutary effect upon her policy. The princes of Lorraine turned the king's attention towards Germany, reminding him that there had once been an ancient kingdom of Austrasia, of which the capital had been Metz. They also sent help to the Queen-dowager of Scotland, their sister, who refused to marry her daughter, Mary Stuart, to the young King of England, though the latter's crown was his marriage portion. Montmorency, despite the advice of the majority of the council, resumed hostilities against England and for a while hoped to invade that country. Plans of all the English fortresses were secured; the channels of the Thames were sounded; a connection was formed with the Irish, as there was already a connection with Scotland. But the plan did not proceed far towards realisation; Boulogne alone was vigorously attacked, and the English eventually restored that town for a fifth of the stipulated sum, Edward VI. abandoning his claim to the pensions which Henry VIII. had demanded.

In Germany, Charles V., having defeated the Protestants at Mühlberg, found himself more powerful than any emperor had been for five centuries. He kept the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse in prison, settled religious matters at his pleasure without consulting the pope, and political questions without consulting the diet, and was as absolute in the empire as he was in Italy and Spain.

Henry II. did not allow this triumph to become a source of weakness and danger to France. He secretly allied with Maurice of Saxony, one of the emperor's generals, who betrayed him, and published a manifesto in which he declared himself to be the protector of the liberties of Germany. A cap of liberty between two daggers was engraved at the beginning of this document. Like his father, he assured himself of the support of the Turks; he bought back Boulogne from the English and won them over to his side, recalled the French prelates from the Council of Trent, and declared war on the pope, the emperor's ally, by supporting against him the Farnese family in Parma and Piacenza. But he shed the blood of his Protestant subjects, as a species of reparation for undertaking this line of policy which made him the enemy of the orthodox, the friend of heretics or unbelievers. The Edict of Chateaubriant ordered that Protestants should not be allowed an appeal, closed the schools and judicial offices to all who had not a certificate of orthodoxy, and

by a provision borrowed from the worst times of the Roman Empire, assured a third of the goods of their victims to informers.

Conquest of Metz, Toul, and Verdun (1552).—Charles V., surprised by Maurice of Saxony, was almost taken prisoner at Innsbruck and was forced to fly at night by torchlight in a litter and in the midst of a terrible storm (1551). At this news, Henry II. advanced into Lorraine with 30,000 men. Toul opened its gates (March, 1552); Metz, a free and flourishing city, would only allow the commanders of the army to enter, but the soldiers followed and Metz became French. An attempt was made to take Strasburg, another great free city, by the same stratagem, but the burghers replied with cannon fire. Henry was only able to boast that he had watered his horses in the Rhine. On his return journey he entered Verdun. The three cities were included in the list of French provinces under the name of the Three Bishoprics.

Siege of Metz (1552–1553).—This bold advance of France towards her ancient frontiers displeased the emperor more than the treason of Maurice had done. He signed the Convention of Passau with the Lutherans in order to be free to turn all his forces and all his hatred against his secular foe. He invaded Lorraine at the head of 60,000 men. Francis of Guise threw himself into Metz with the flower of the French nobility and prepared for defence by collecting provisions, destroying five abbeys, seven *faubourgs*, and nineteen churches. Fortifications, in the construction of which the nobles themselves assisted, were raised in all haste. The advance guard of the enemy appeared on October 19, 1552, and the attack began on October 30. Charles spent two months on the siege; he fired fourteen thousand shots into the place, opened a breach a hundred paces broad, but was not even able to make an assault, since behind each part of the wall knocked down the besiegers raised a new wall, with ditches, barricades, and mines which destroyed the besiegers' works and frustrated their efforts. The rains began in November; December brought frost and fever. The imperial army had lost a third of its effectives when Charles decided to raise the siege. He retired on January 1 cursing fortune. "I see clearly that fortune is a woman," he said; "she loves a young king better than an old emperor." He should rather have blamed himself, since he had undertaken such an operation at the most unfavourable season of the year. On January 15, the last troops left their camp, leaving behind them a crowd of wounded and dying. "In whatever direction

one looked, one saw nothing but dead soldiers or those who had a little life left in them lying in heaps of dung ; or others seated on great stones, their limbs frostbitten to the knees, unable to rise and crying out for mercy, for some one to put them out of their misery. In the huts, complaint was made of all manner of illnesses. In every direction were vast, new graveyards. The roads were filled with dead horses, with tents, arms, and other goods, all abandoned." The Duke of Guise relieved this terrible misery as far as he could.

Battle of Renty (1554): Victory of Brissac: Abdication of Charles V. (1556).—In the following year, the emperor besieged Thérouanne in Artois. The weak garrison which held it only capitulated after a brave defence ; Charles razed the place to the ground and it has never been rebuilt. Hesdin was treated in the same way, the emperor soothing his wounded pride by waging an atrocious war. In 1554 Henry II. answered ravage by ravage, wasting Hainault and Brabant ; sacking Marienburg, Dinant, and at the other extremity of the Low Countries attacking Renty near St. Omer. The emperor wished to relieve the place ; Guise and Tavannes defeated his cavalry. But the French army, lacking supplies, was obliged to raise the siege.

At the same time, Brissac, by a series of operations which remain models of their kind, maintained himself with a weak army in Piedmont, despite the Duke of Alva, and captured Casal, the capital of Montferrat. Strozzi and Montluc defended Sienna in Tuscany against the Florentines and imperialists ; the Turks threatened Naples, and finally Baron de la Garde, the French admiral in the Levant, sacked the Isle of Elba and effected a landing in Corsica. The defeat of Metz was not repaired ; France seemed to be rejuvenated under her new king, and Charles V. grew weary of this struggle which he had carried on for thirty-five years. He resigned the Low Countries, Italy, and Spain to his son Philip, and sought in the monastery of Yuste that repose which never falls to the lot of ambition (1556).

Alliance between France and the Pope to free Italy (1557).—Charles V. had not left all his crowns to his son ; Austria and the imperial title passed to his brother Ferdinand. The house of Austria was divided, but at the moment at which Philip lost Germany he appeared to acquire England by his second marriage with Mary Tudor. He had already a son, Don Carlos, to whom he reserved all the Spanish possessions, while it was arranged that any son of this new marriage should reign over England

and the Low Countries, so that London and Antwerp would be under the same master, the Thames and Scheldt obey the same laws, and the North Sea become an English lake. And so France, alike in the present and in the future, was seriously threatened by this new domination by which she would be shut in on three sides, and which might open the way for an English invasion. And she could now no longer rely upon the help of Germany. Henry II. had at the beginning of 1556 signed the Treaty of Vaucelles with Charles V.; he broke it in the same year, in order that Philip might not have time to consolidate his position. A fiery old man, Paul IV., then held the papacy; he was alarmed at seeing the Spaniards on either side of him, in Naples and Milan. The king and the pope formed an alliance. An army, commanded by Montmorency, was sent into the Low Countries, while another, under the Duke of Guise, was despatched to Italy. The allies aimed at confining Philip to Spain; Henry II. was to increase his dominion by the acquisition of all the neighbouring provinces which he might easily hold; Francis of Guise, as the descendant of the house of Anjou in the female line, was to be King of Naples. The plan was well conceived. The energetic Paul IV. placed his spiritual weapons at the disposal of France and of the Italian cause, and launched a sentence of excommunication against the *Most Catholic King*.

Battle of St. Quentin (August 10, 1557).—Philip II. ordered Emmanuel-Philibert, Duke of Savoy, who had been despoiled of his lands by the French and owed everything to Spain, to oppose Montmorency; he sent the Duke of Alva, a true Spaniard, utterly devoted to the Church but still more devoted to his king, against Francis of Guise. Guise, who was received in triumph at Rome by Paul IV., penetrated into the Abruzzi, but was checked near Civitella by the clever strategy of his opponent. Emmanuel-Philibert, after a feint attack on Champagne, suddenly fell upon St. Quentin, where he was joined by 7000 English. The place was without walls, munitions, or food. Admiral Coligny threw himself into it with 700 men; Montmorency drew near to revictual it, but came so close to the enemy with an inferior force and took so little care to retain freedom of movement, that he was forced to fight without having assured his retreat. Emmanuel-Philibert turned his position, attacked him in the front and on the flank, and completely defeated him. A Bourbon, the Duke d'Enghien, and a Viscount of Turenne were killed; another Bourbon, the Duke de Montpensier, the Constable Montmorency, Marshal St. André, and the Duke of

Longueville were taken with 4000 men, all the artillery and baggage. The French lost more than 10,000 dead and wounded.

Defence of St. Quentin by Coligny.—"My son is at Paris?" asked Charles V. when he heard, in the depth of his retreat at St. Yuste, of this great French defeat. Philip was not at Paris, nor did he reach that city. His cold and methodical mind, obstinate, but without daring, did not allow him to follow up the victory. Before making any advance, he wished to secure St. Quentin, and that place held out for seventeen days. Coligny, knowing that the safety of France depended on its fate, made heroic efforts to prolong its defence. Time to assemble forces was thus secured, and Philip, after taking Ham and Catelet, retired into the Low Countries, small results following upon a victory which appeared to be as disastrous for France as the defeats of Poitiers and Agincourt.

Recapture of Calais (1558).—Henry II. had recalled the Duke of Guise from Italy in all haste. The victor of Metz and Renty left the Duke of Alva to kneel before the pope while imposing on him the will of Spain, and hastened to receive the title of lieutenant-general of the kingdom with unlimited powers. All the nobles hastened to him; Guise answered the universal expectation. While a feint turned the attention of the enemy towards Luxemburg, the duke suddenly invested Calais (January 1, 1558). The English, relying on the fortifications of the place, and on the marshes by which it was surrounded, had left only 900 men there. Two forts protected the town; that of Nieullay on the land side and that of Risbanck on the side of the sea. Guise attacked the former with vigour and carried it on January 3. Risbanck fell into his power on the same day. On January 6, he attacked the town itself, and next day the garrison capitulated. The last shameful memory of the Hundred Years' War was thus wiped out; the English no longer held an inch of land in France. An attempt to avenge the loss by an attack on Brest was unsuccessful, the Breton peasants driving into the sea some troops who were landed at Conquet. The blow killed Queen Mary. "If my heart is opened," she said as she lay dying, "Calais will be found engraved on it." It shattered also the Anglo-Spanish alliance; Elizabeth, who succeeded her sister Mary on the English throne, effected the triumph of Protestantism in that island, and as a result became the irreconcilable enemy of Spain.

Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis (1559).—Philip II., a man of gloomy and fanatical temperament, aimed at securing the dominion

of Europe by different means from those which his father had adopted. Half Germany and all the Scandinavian kingdoms were separated from Rome; the Reformation, stifled in Italy and Spain, was active in France, extended over the Low Countries, and triumphed in Scotland and England. Philip formed the design of destroying Protestantism. He wished to become the right hand of Catholicism throughout Europe, the right hand of the holy see, the executor of the sentences of the Church. His faith and his ambition were in agreement, since if he slew heresy, he was well aware that this would be to the profit, not only of orthodox Christianity, but also of his own power, and that unity of religion implied the unity of his own dominions. Having this design, a war with France for some frontier places seemed to him to be impolitic at the moment, and he wished to treat with Henry II. in order to win him over to aid his plans. Before peace was concluded some conflicts occurred. Guise took Thionville, Thermes, Dunkirk, Bergues, and Nieuport, but suffered a defeat by allowing himself to be caught at Gravelines between Count Egmont who attacked him in front and an English fleet, the cannon of which played upon his flanks. On April 3, 1559, peace was at last signed.

By this treaty, that of Cateau-Cambrésis, France retained the Three Bishoprics (Metz, Toul, and Verdun) with their territories. She had already recovered Boulogne, and she now retained Calais, undertaking to pay a sum of 500,000 crowns to the English if she did not restore the town within eight years, which she had no intention of doing. The kings of France and Spain mutually restored their conquests on the frontiers of the Low Countries and Italy, with the exception of Piedmont, in which district the French retained several towns until the rights of Henry's grandmother, Louise of Savoy, should have been decided. The acquisitions of France were valuable; she was protected by them against Germany and England. But one of the negotiators, Montmorency, was accused of having sacrificed the interests of his country from his wish to regain his liberty the sooner. France actually ceded Thionville, Marienburg, Montmédy, Damvilliers, the county of Charolais, as well as 189 towns or castles which she had seized in the Low Countries and Italy, in return for the recovery of St. Quentin, Ham, Catelet, and some places of no importance which the Spaniards handed over to them. "Sire," said Guise and Brissac bitterly, "you have surrendered in one day more than you would have lost in thirty years of defeat." The possession of places in Italy

was neither necessary nor advantageous to France, since they offered a constant temptation to engage in further expeditions across the Alps. But wholly French lands, Bugey, Bresse, and Savoy, were abandoned; they should have been preserved at all costs, especially as the Spaniards did not restore to Jeanne d'Albret that part of the kingdom of Navarre which they had held for half a century.

Accidental Death of the King (1559).—It was in order to be free to wage war to the death on heresy that Henry II. had displayed such fatal haste, but he had no time to carry out his design. A double marriage was to cement the peace; Philip II. was to marry Elizabeth, daughter of the French king, and Emmanuel-Philibert was to marry the king's sister, Marguerite. Brilliant fêtes were held before the departure of the princesses. The tournament was still popular, and Henry II. showed much skill and grace in it. After many brilliant passages of arms and when the sports seemed to be ended he wished to have a final course against the captain of his guard, Count Montgomery. The two lances struck each other, but the count did not lower the lance which he held in his hand quickly enough, and striking the king on his visor, his lance pierced it, the point entering Henry's eye and penetrating to his brain. The king fell mortally wounded; eleven days later he died, aged forty-one. It was a serious loss, less on account of the character of Henry II. than because his death left his power to children. Royal authority was absolute; held by a vigorous hand it might have dispelled the dangers with which the new theology and ambitions of all kinds threatened the state, whereas three kings, minors in age or intellect, left France for thirty years a prey to the horrors of a religious and political war.

CHAPTER XLI

GOVERNMENT OF FRANCIS I. AND HENRY II.

Results of the Wars of Francis I. and Henry II.—The Peace of Cateau-Cambrésis ended the first period of the rivalry between the houses of France and Austria. Turned by Charles VIII. from the paths which led to her true greatness, France for sixty-five years made trial of fortune with extraordinary light-heartedness in distant expeditions and in a land "which Nature had divided from her by manners, language, and a lofty chain

of mountains." Four times the French established themselves at Naples; their cannon had reechoed over the lagoons of Venice, and their standards had floated over Sienna, Milan, and Genoa. Defeated at last, France held only some small places in Piedmont, and it was possible to say with Comines, "The French have left no trace in Italy except their graves."

But if France had lost much, she had also gained much. The victories of Fornovo, Ravenna, Marignano, and Cerisoles had wiped out the shame of Guinegate, Pavia, and St. Quentin. The honour of having contended victoriously with Charles V. had increased the prestige of France and had made a nation which a century earlier had been ransomed and pillaged by English archers the foremost state on the continent. Since 1494, she had gained only Calais, Metz, Toul, Verdun, and some minor places in Italy, but she had saved Europe from the hegemony of Charles V. and Germany from the despotism of the house of Austria.

The great danger for France and for Europe in the sixteenth century was the overwhelming power of this Austrian family, which ruled on the Rhine and on the Danube, in Italy and in Spain, and which held a further vast empire across the sea. The war begun by Charles VIII. gave Naples, which was seized by Ferdinand the Catholic, to that dynasty, and Milan was acquired by Charles V. Before 1494, Italy, though corrupt and divided, was at least mistress of herself; the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis consecrated her servitude, and from that day until the nineteenth century she remained, to her own hurt and to that of Europe, under foreign rulers.

Defeated beyond the Alps, French policy triumphed across the Rhine. Imperial authority, which had been extinct before Charles V., had been momentarily revived by him with the result that there was ground for fearing he would extinguish alike the political and the religious liberties of the states of the empire at one blow. France assisted the German princes to defend themselves, and the Peace of Augsburg guaranteed at once their independence and the triumph of Protestantism (1555). If only the true interests of Germany are considered, this victory of the princes was an evil; the land remained weighed down by a crowd of indigent princelings, the prey of anarchy and oppression, instead of developing into a strong and united state. But it was good for France, because a monarchy, loyally obeyed from the Meuse to the Oder, from the Alps to the North Sea, would have exposed the French monarchy to great dangers.

Two centuries of weakness, misery, and darkness were the result for Germany of the triumph of the princes of the League of Schmalkalde. Nor was the acquisition of Italy any compensation to the house of Austria. Poor and robust, the German people might have enabled their real leader to secure the domination of Europe, while declining Italy was a fair domain which impoverished her foreign master who was forced to honour and defend her.

Internal Political Results: Increase of Royal Power.—The sixteenth century presents a singular contrast. The spirit of revolt is apparent in arts, letters, philosophy, and religion. Everything was reformed except policy. Ancient powers trembled and fell; Gothic architecture gave way before that of the Renaissance, the fables and chivalrous legends of the Middle Ages before the new-found masterpieces of ancient Greece and Rome. Monarchy alone continued its onward march, and the Italian wars consolidated the absolute power of the kings, converting the great states into military monarchies.

In France, the nation had not lost its unity in the face of danger; it had rallied round its king, the symbol of national union and independence. The very nobility, held constantly under the curb, became accustomed to military obedience, and the work begun by Louis XI. on the scaffold was completed by his successors in the camp.

Louis XII. won popularity by his generosity; Francis bound the people to him by his natural gift for command, by his easy magnificence, and by his proud will, which led all to recognise in him their master. From the very first he entered upon the possession of absolute power, and without any pride or desire to oppress he found, as if naturally, the confidant formula with which all his laws conclude, "For such is our good pleasure." And this good pleasure nothing could resist, since the king had under his control a standing army and the whole wealth of the country at his disposal. "France," said a Venetian ambassador in 1546, "is the most united country in the world." And he added, "The will of the king is everything, even in the administration of justice, since no one dares to obey his conscience in opposition to the monarch. I am not speaking of that which it is customary to say, but of that which I have myself observed." Thus with Francis I. began that order of things which is known under the name of the *ancien régime*.

Transformation of Feudalism.—In the middle of the sixteenth century, there remained only one great feudal family, that o

Bourbon-Navarre, whose head, Anthony of Bourbon, had neither consideration nor influence. In addition, there were still great nobles to be found, the families of Montmorency, Guise, La Trémoille, Chatillon, and so forth, but no great vassals. Feudalism had lost authority even more than possessions. Where the lords had preserved their lands, they were jealously watched by the bailiffs and seneschals of the king, who in the name of public order repressed violence, as the parliaments in the name of the law punished crimes. If some distant province escaped this dual supervision, royal commissioners held there *grands jours*, where all complaints were heard and where harsh justice was administered. At that of Poitiers in 1531, five hundred accused persons were tried in two months and a large number of gentlemen were found guilty. The nobles still preserved some rights of justice (which the ordinance of Villers-Cotterets declared to be a mere delegation of royal power) and certain feudal privileges in respect of their vassals which were burdensome to the people. But they might neither administer justice nor coin money; they might neither make laws nor wage private wars. They had, in short, no political power, save in so far as they held offices from the king, save in so far as they became lieutenant-generals, governors of provinces, or held command of armies. Reduced to the enjoyment of incomes and titles, they no longer formed a feudal aristocracy; they became the nobility of France, and that nobility hastened to the court which Francis I. opened to them, there to ruin themselves and to obey.

The Clergy.—The concordat of 1516 placed the clergy in dependence on the king, who became the sole grantor of benefices. Parliament tried to preserve the traditions of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, but an edict of 1529 transferred cognisance of all disputes concerning benefices in royal patronage from Parliament to the Great Council. The Edict of Crémieux (1536) restrained the jurisdiction of the nobles; that of Villers-Cotterets (1539) checked the encroachments of episcopal as against royal tribunals bylimiting the competence of the former to spiritual or ecclesiastical cases. Seven-eighths of the suits which came before the courts came before those of the king. At the same time, abbeys were obliged to receive and to support wounded soldiers, and tithes were levied from the clergy, which, though habitually called voluntary gifts, were hardly free-will offerings, especially when they were taken four or five times in one year, amounting on each occasion to 400,000 francs.

The Third Estate.—As for the third estate, it had long been

reduced to obedience. This order included the learned, who were known as "the men of the long robe," merchants, artisans, the people, and the peasants. The merchants, having money, were courted and caressed, but they had neither pre-eminence nor dignity, since every kind of trade was regarded as derogatory for a noble. They paid all taxes in common with the non-noble class and the peasants, the last being the section of the population most roughly treated by the king and by the privileged orders. Content to grow rich, thanks to the good order established by absolute power, the merchants no longer demanded their old communal liberty, which produced an order of things too restless and too expensive for them, and still less modern liberty, which they could attain only after securing equality.

But the "men of the robe" had control of four important offices. "The first was that of the great chancellor, who held the king's seal and without whose advice nothing could be decided," says the Venetian envoy. "The second was that of the secretaries of state who controlled the executive. The third was that of the presidents, councillors, judges, advocates, and all those to whom the administration of civil and criminal justice in the kingdom was entrusted. The fourth was that of the treasurers, collectors, and receivers who administered all the revenues and provided for all the expenses of the crown.

The Parliaments.—The fact that the king chose his chancellor, secretaries, judges, and financiers from the third estate sufficed to secure the development of that order. But the lawyers, from their knowledge, from the fact that their offices were permanent, and from the consideration which they enjoyed, had acquired an importance which inspired them with hope that they might play a great part in the state. Cantoned as it were in their nine fortresses, the parliaments of Aix, Bordeaux, Dijon, Grenoble, Paris, Rennes, Rouen, Toulouse, and Dombes, irremovable from office, and presently given a hereditary position as a result of the sale of offices, the lawyers already possessed two essentially political rights, that of remonstrating against royal ordinances and that of registration, without which no act of the royal will possessed the force of law. Francis I. broke through this last barrier against absolutism, which Louis XII. had respected. In 1527, he forbade the parliament of Paris "to interfere in any matter of state, or with anything except the administration of justice," and would not allow it to comment upon the reforms which he introduced into the legal system. The magistracy submitted; it went further. In Roman law, which

it studied with avidity and which it preserved in order to break down feudal privileges, it found that the emperor was the living embodiment of the law, and in 1527 the president of the parliament of Paris strongly declared that the king was above the laws, though his will should be restrained by reason and equity.

The States-General.—Subdued in detail, the three orders might have recovered their power by union. Francis I. took care not to summon the States-General, replacing them (1526) by an assembly composed partly of notables and partly of the deputies of Burgundy, and later (1527) by an assembly of notables, which aided him in repudiating the Treaty of Madrid, but took no other part in the affairs of state. "Thus," says Suriano, "each did his duty and contributed in his turn to the good of the state, aiding the king, the clergy by their advice, the third estate by their wealth, and the nobles by consecrating their lives to his service, with the result that they have made France invincible and formidable to the rest of the world."

Henry II., like his father, avoided bringing the deputies of the nation face to face with a prodigal court. After St. Quentin, he was, however, forced to summon at least an assembly of notables. In this meeting the members of the parliament sat apart as a fourth estate, ranking after the nobles, but before the third estate. The assembly exhibited its patriotism; the clergy promised a million, the third estate gave two millions; the nobles offered their goods and their lives, giving the latter willingly, but withholding the former.

General Administration.—As a survival of the feudal period, the great offices of the court still remained part of the administration, so that the constable had control of all the armies, the admiral of all the fleets of the kingdom. But in the sixteenth century the later ministerial omnipotence began. The clerks of the closet became secretaries of state, charged with the conduct of all the king's correspondence as to public affairs. An ordinance of Henry II. (1547) fixed their number at four, each of whom corresponded with one-fourth of the kingdom and one-fourth of foreign countries. The assignment of secretaries to special business began at a later date; thus, in time, one was given the management of all matters touching the royal household and later also of all ecclesiastical affairs. The other three secretaries were those of war, created in 1619 and 1636; of foreign affairs, created in 1626; of marine, created under Louis XIV. France was still divided between them geographically so far as the matters which they treated in common were concerned.

The chancellor presided over justice, the superintendent over finance. The secret police began at the same time, that great weapon of monarchical times; Catherine de Medici wrote to Charles IX., "the king has eyes and ears everywhere."

The Army.—In the army, the gendarmerie alone was French; the infantry were foreigners, generally Germans or Swiss. In 1534, Francis I. revived an idea of Charles VII. and tried to create a national infantry. He exempted from the *taille* all men fit for military service who would register themselves. They formed seven regiments, each 6000 strong, commanded by officers nominated by the king. These territorial regiments did not render all the services which were expected from them; the nascent institution was too soon abandoned in order to return to the former bodies, which were more costly and also more warlike, and whom the king paid by means of a new *taille* of 1,200,000 livres. Henry II. revived and improved the plan of his father, but the civil wars disorganised everything and destroyed the territorial troops. Richelieu and Louis XIV. restored this national infantry, so long despised, and it became the first in the world. The direction of the artillery had been centralised by Louis XI. in the hands of a single grand master; Francis increased the duties and pay of this office which became one of the most important in the state. He placed ten provinces, all on the frontiers, under the control of special governors, who were to keep them in a state of good security, well fortified and defended. This was the origin of the great French military governments, the number of which was eventually increased to thirty-two. The need of defending France against the great adversary who threatened her led to the beginning of the construction on the frontiers of a double line of fortresses, and Francis introduced from Italy the construction of earthworks in order to withstand the damage wrought by artillery on stone fortifications.

Navy and Colonies.—Francis I. had a real navy. He equipped galleys on the Mediterranean, and this fleet was so strong and so well led by Baron de la Garde that the French flag there seemed to dominate the sea. On the Atlantic more great ships were built which had both sails and oars, and the port of Le Havre was formed as a base for them.

The colonial movement which has changed the face of the globe began at this time. Francis wished to share in the division of America between the Spaniards and the English. The Basques, Bretons, and Normans founded the fisheries of Newfoundland

in 1504. The explorer Verazzani examined the coasts of North America by the king's order (1524); Jacques Cartier entered the St. Lawrence and discovered Canada (1535). The merchant navy increased naturally without official support. A trader of Dieppe, Ango, having been attacked by the Portuguese during a voyage, blockaded Lisbon and compelled the king to pay an indemnity.

Finances.—An extremely complex administration, numerous armies, the newly-founded fleet, and a luxurious court demanded the expenditure of vast sums. Francis I., in order to be able at will to empty the public purse, united his private revenue with the income of the state by the creation of the *épargne*, "a great sea into which all receipts flowed." Without the assent of the pope, he induced the French clergy to pay a regular subsidy. He raised the *taille* from seven to sixteen millions, increased the *gabelle* (the salt tax), which he extended to all the provinces of the kingdom (1542). In 1522 he borrowed 200,000 livres at 8½ per cent., and thus formed the first permanent *rentes* of the Hôtel de Ville, the origin of the national debt of France. In the same year he created a fourth chamber of the parliament of Paris, in order to secure 1,200,000 livres, and after that date he often sold the offices of law, finance, and administration. This was a disastrous measure, which needlessly increased the number of king's men, diminished the number of those liable to the *taille*, and made the administration of justice more expensive for the people. A still more unhappy idea, borrowed from Italy, was that of a royal lottery (1539). The sale of offices, which made the magistracy hereditary, may be excused by pointing out the fact that from this the great magisterial families, one of the glories of old France, arose; it is rare indeed that an evil is so great that it does not produce even a little good. But the common sense of the people soon warned them that some had sold the judicial offices which they had bought, and as early as 1560 the states of Orleans vigorously complained of this scandalous traffic and demanded its abolition.

The author of the measures of Francis which are most condemned was the Chancellor Duprat, who is described as observing no laws save his own interest and the passions of the king, and as taking money from the people by means which were altogether evil and entirely contrary to the laws and customs of France. Duprat was useful in another way to Francis I. To him were attributed the exactions, violence, and bad faith of the govern-

ment, and the knightly reputation of the king was saved by the odious reputation of the minister.

The financial administration of Henry II. was disastrous; he so increased the loans at high interest, 12 per cent., which his father had introduced, that he left 543,000 livres of debt secured on his towns, and a floating debt of 17,000,000, while the annual sum available for the treasury was only 12,000,000. Before the time of Francis I., the duties on imports produced hardly six or seven thousand livres. Francis increased them, and under Henry II. all foreign goods were indiscriminately taxed on entering the kingdom at the rate of two crowns a quintal and 4 per cent. on their taxable value. Such were the modest beginnings of the protectionist regime.

General Prosperity: Simple Manners of the Nation.—If the taxes were heavy, they were easily borne, since general prosperity increased more rapidly than public expenses. Agriculturists introduced the cultivation of maize from Italy; two Genoese created the silk manufacture of Lyons (1536), and a commercial bank was established in that city. Thus, in opposition to the real wealth of the nobles, the personal wealth of the bourgeoisie was gradually formed; they were at first nothing, but became almost everything. If the land remained, as in the Middle Ages, in the hands of the nobles, capital, the great power of modern times, accumulated in the hands of the traders. Bodin asserts that between 1515 and 1568 more gold was collected in France than it had been possible to collect before in the course of two centuries, and the Venetian envoy pertinently remarks that the bourgeoisie had become the masters of money. Ango, like Jacques Cœur in another age, made the fortune of a prince.

But this prosperity did not destroy the simplicity of the manners of the bourgeoisie. During the reign of Henry II., Gilles le Maitre, first president of the parliament, stipulated in a lease of some land which he possessed near Paris that his farmers, at the four great festivals of the year and at the vintage, should bring him a covered carriage with fresh straw in it, in which his wife and daughter might sit, and an ass for his chamber-maid, while he himself was content to ride before them on his mule, accompanied by his clerk on foot.

CHAPTER XLII

THE RENAISSANCE UNDER FRANCIS I. AND HENRY II.

The Renaissance.—The Middle Ages now passed away. The state had already assumed a new character, only some scattered traces remaining of that which it had so long possessed. Now the human intellect, which was still bound by a thousand ties to ancient ideas, endeavoured to break those bonds. The first struggle had been led by the kings; every one took part in the second, artists, poets, and doctors joining haphazard in a mood of adventure, and this very impulsiveness contained much that was heroic and captivating.

This revolt against the dominion of the old has received its just epithet, the Renaissance. It was the bright dawn of human reason, the springtime of the soul. After a long and harsh winter, the earth sprang to new life under the kindly rays of the sun. A rich seed had been planted in it; now it bore a capricious but plentiful harvest, a vegetation which covered and hid the old soil though supported by it; just as vigorous plants, springing from the foot of an old oak, embrace and protect it with their young roots. Everything was born again—art, science, philosophy—and the world, held fast for two centuries in the morass into which it had fallen during the Middle Ages, now travelled once more towards the light and the purer air of reason.

This revolution has one peculiar characteristic, which makes the sixteenth century one of the great ages of human history. The men of this time looked rather to the past than to the future. They did not feel that confidence in themselves which was later displayed by their descendants. If they abandoned the masters whom they had so lately followed, it was to place themselves under the guidance of other and more ancient masters. But that which was a step backwards was also a step forwards. To return to antiquity was to return, in matters of intellect, to the beautiful, the true, to independence of mind, to that rationalism which, having once been the law of Greek and Roman society, was now to become that of modern civilisation.

The Artistic Renaissance.—When the French crossed the Alps they found in Italy the infancy of a new art. In architecture, the right angle or the arcade, the dome, massive and plain columns, the modest ornaments of Greek and Roman origin

were mingled with those which were the product of a new taste in religious and secular art. The acute angle, the pointed arch, light columns, and the rich ornamentation of the last age of pointed architecture appeared. Statues were no longer hidden in niches on the churches, concealed under the heavy and weighty draperies of the saints. The sculptor worked freely, treating all subjects, studying the nude, studying especially antiquity, the masterpieces of which were constantly being discovered. The painter found on his palette, recently enriched with new colours, the beauty of colour and variety of tonality which gave life to all details and finish to his design. Michael Angelo completed the dome of St. Peter's which Bramante had begun, carving his great statue of Moses, and painting his great picture of the *Last Judgment;* Raphael, the favourite artist of Leo X., gave the world his *School of Athens*, his *Dispute on the Holy Sacrament*, and his divine Madonnas.

France was still far from possessing a school of painting, and could show only excellent stained glass, made by such able workers as Claude and William of Marseilles, whom Julius II. summoned to make the windows of the Vatican, those "marvels fallen from Heaven," as Vasari calls them.

But in architecture and sculpture she had entered on the new path. Roger Ango, the *maître des ouvrages* at Rouen, did not wait until Louis XII. had brought Fra Giocondo from Italy to begin the *Palais de Justice* of the capital of Normandy, one of the masterpieces of monumental art in France. Others raised in Paris the chapel of the *Hôtel de Cluny* and the *Hôtel de La Trémoille*, of which the last remains now adorn the School of Fine Arts. At St. Quentin, Dreux, and Nevers the curious houses of these towns arose; at Blois the eastern façade of the château. Sculpture, which in the middle of the previous century had known so well how to decorate the house of Jacques Cœur at Bourges, did not lag behind her elder sister, as the tombs of George d'Amboise at Rouen and of the Duke of Brittany at Nantes bear witness.

A truly French art was thus formed, which preserved from the past that which seems so suited to the French climate, great, bold masses, as well as that exterior decoration which buildings with flat roofs cannot stand; turrets artistically placed at the angles, arcades in front of the buildings, which permit every variation in the form of the arch and allow the construction of towers of every kind, which serve to break the uniform lines. All that was needed to make this a true Renaissance was

more lightness, grace, and richness, more knowledge of anatomy and of architecture, and above all that regulated irregularity, one of the signs of a period when the human intellect regains its liberty, which covered monuments with beautiful arabesques, garlands of flowers and leaves, graceful dances of imaginary or real beings who run between the pillars of the colonnades, descend the front of the building, or fill the elegant curves of the arches.

France did not therefore owe everything to Francis I., as Benvenuto Cellini affirms, having an interest in promoting the idea that prior to the arrival of the Italian artists the art of the country was wholly barbarous. Yet it is true, as he adds, that the talented received from this king a liberal and powerful measure of protection. Italy, the Italy of Raphael and Michael Angelo, had much to teach France, and Francis I. borrowed both masters and models. He bought or was given in Italy more than a hundred statues, among which were the *Laocoon*, the *Venus de Medici*, and the two slaves of Michael Angelo destined for the tomb of Julius II. He acquired the *Mona Lisa* from Leonardo da Vinci; from Raphael the portrait of *Jeanne of Aragon*, his *St. Michael*, and his *Holy Family*, which are still among the most precious ornaments of the Louvre. By his consideration, friendship, and above all by his favours, he attracted the most distinguished Italian masters to him, among them the aged Leonardo da Vinci, Rosso, Primatice, Andréa del Sarto, Benvenuto Cellini, to build châteaux for him or to decorate his palaces, to excite the emulation of native artists, and to inspire them with a desire to be an honour to the French school.

Fontainebleau, St. Germain, Chambord, Chenonceaux.—The sight of the rich palaces and beautiful villas of Italy had been a revelation to the French and had caused them to realise the icy cold and bareness of the sombre and gloomy manor houses in which their fathers had lived. A new society came into being. At this brilliant court of great lords and young ladies, of poets and artists, new dwellings were needed, and Francis I. supplied them. In the mild valley of the Loire, the favourite sojourn of the Valois, he built the marvel of his reign, the château of Chambord, and that of Azai-le-Rideau; he began Chenonceaux, and completed Amboise.

Fontainebleau arose in the depth of the fairest forest of France at a place where Louis VII., Philip Augustus, and St. Louis had already occupied a manor house, inhabited also by Louis XI.

The great work was begun in 1528; the buildings of the court of the Cheval Blanc, of the Cour Ovale, Cour de la Fontaine, show traces of the influence of the Italian artists. But memorials of the previous age also appear. Fontainebleau was already by the time of Francis I., and later still more so, a medley of buildings of all kinds and of all ages, a "rendezvous of palaces," as it has been called. Tablets and windows of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries appear in the midst of Tuscan columns and under Grecian arcades. The dome lies between little turrets which flank the long pillared galleries. Beautiful sculptures and pagan statues of the Renaissance period are found side by side with the bizarre and grinning figures of the Middle Ages.

In the interior, some of the richest decorations are found in the gallery of Francis I., which Rosso painted and where Benvenuto Cellini placed his silver Jupiter. Another gallery, that of the fêtes, or of Henry II., which Primatice painted, has been almost entirely redecorated since that date.

Chambord has more artistic unity and was an entirely French creation. Pierre Nepveu, an architect of Blois, and not Vignole or Primatice, constructed this wonderful building in the Sologne, the graceful majesty of which strikes the beholder with amazement when he comes in sight of it from one of the long avenues which cut through the great park in the midst of which it stands. Its façade is formed by two rows of galleries and arcades, and by the air and light which they allow to circulate round the building they lighten the donjon which is flanked by four great towers as in the previous age. In the interior, the great staircase, a veritable masterpiece, is surmounted by a graceful cupola which dominates a forest of domes and campaniles scattered over the different points of the building. The "F's" engraved on the marble arches, with the salamanders in the midst of flames, and the traces of the Duchess of Étampes and of the Countess of Chateaubriant which may be recognised in the figures in the carvings, still speak, in the midst of that dismantled glory, of the first guest who dwelled there.

After Chambord may be mentioned Chenonceaux, a smaller and less pretentious building; St. Germain, a more severe château with a military character; Madrid, in the Bois de Boulogne, where traces of Arab architecture may be found; Folembray, near Laon, which the imperialists burned; Villers-Cotterets, which after having sheltered the elegant and joyous court of Francis I., became a retreat for the misery of his old age; and finally the numerous châteaux which the nobles, in imitation

of their king, raised in place of their donjons. Thus Duprat built his sumptuous dwelling of Nantouillet; Semblancay, the château of that name near Tours; Montmorency, Écouen and Chantilly. At Écouen, with borrowed materials Jean Bullant made an original and exquisite work which inaugurated the second period of the Renaissance in France, in which the last traces of the pointed style finally gave place to works formed by imagination playing with ancient models.

Pierre Lescot and the Louvre.—These châteaux were only summer residences. Buildings which were more splendid and more severe, designed to be the official homes of monarchy, arose in the capital, built by French artists. Pierre Lescot, born at Paris in 1510, died in 1571, formed the plan of the Louvre (1541). Four rows of vast walls, pierced at irregular intervals by small windows, flanked by ten towers, and having in their midst a great tower which served as a prison and a treasury, such was the dwelling of the ancient kings of France. It was on the ruins of a building of another age that there arose by degrees a palace which, despite the changes which have been made in it, remains the most complete expression of the French Renaissance. Pierre Lescot only built part of the façade, where the pavilion of *l'Horloge* is found. Outside it there is a ground floor with Corinthian columns; the first floor is of a composite character; the second follows classical types, and is tastefully decorated with the beautiful and shapely sculptures of Jean Goujon and Paul Ponce, which are perhaps a little out of proportion; and the whole is dominated by a central pavilion with bold outlines. Such was the original plan which other artists and other ages developed; it is possible to trace the decline of monumental art in France by studying the various parts of this palace. Henry II., Charles IX., and Henry IV. continued the wing which led towards the Seine, and the building parallel with the river, in which the delicate beauty of the Renaissance genius is shown. But the majestic colonnade of Pérrault is cold with its heavy and bare decoration, and one has only to compare that part of the façade facing the Seine which was built by Louis XIV., with that which was executed under Henry II. and Henry IV., to see what art has lost. In the latter, stone lives and speaks; in the former it is solemn and mournful.

Philibert Delorme and the Tuileries.—The second great French architect of this period, Philibert Delorme, had crossed the Alps (1534) in order to study the monuments of antiquity and the palaces of the Renaissance. On his return to Lyons, his native place, he built there the beautiful gateway of St. Nizier; then

Cardinal Bellay attracted him to Paris and brought him to the notice of Henry II. He continued Fontainebleau and made the plans of the châteaux of Anet, Meudon, and St. Maur. Catherine de Medici made him her superintendent of buildings. She had brought a taste for literature and the arts from Tuscany. Philibert Delorme, in one of his writings, praises her for the great pleasure which she took in architecture, drawing up and preparing the plans and elevations of the buildings which she wished constructed. It was by her orders that he began (1564) the château of the Tuileries. The central pavilion (then surmounted by a beautiful cupola and by four campaniles, which have unhappily been replaced by an unsightly square dome), two parallel galleries (with their entrances in arcades, surmounted by terraces of which one has been removed), and the two first pavilions, built with Ionian and Corinthian pillars conjoined, were the work of Philibert Delorme. Henry IV. altered this graceful *ensemble* and enlarged it by two masses of buildings; Louis XIII. caused the construction of the massive pavilions of Flore and Marsan, which completed the château. Louis XIV. united the masterpieces of Pierre Lescot and Philibert Delorme by continuing the great gallery of the Louvre to the Tuileries.

Architecture is pre-eminent among the plastic arts; the others are its servants. The great French architects found sculptors to interpret their thought and to give to the buildings which they raised that rich and light ornamentation which is now a lost art. The tomb of Louis XII. at St. Denis is a building of rare elegance, with its twelve open arcades, under which the twelve apostles are seated; the bas-reliefs which decorate its lower stories, the four great figures placed at the angles, and the two statues of the king and queen which crown the structure. It was perhaps the work of Italian artists, if Jean Juste of Tours came originally from Florence, but the cenotaphs of Jacques de Brézé, of Admiral Chabot, and of Francis I. are certainly the work of Frenchmen. Philibert Delorme designed the last, which may still be admired at St. Denis. The bas-reliefs represent the great deeds of the king and are the work of an unknown Frenchman, who gave to his country his pupil, Jean Goujon, the greatest of her sculptors.

Jean Goujon, Germain Pillon, Jean Cousin, Bernard Palissy.—Jean Goujon has deserved the epithets of the *French Phidias* and the *Corrector of sculpture*. He combined a knowledge of anatomy with sureness of touch and finished skill with the chisel; his style was vigorous yet full of grace. The chief

examples of his work which remain are his caryatides in the *Salle des Gardes* at the Louvre, the beautiful figures on the fountain of the Innocents, a group of Diana the Huntress, and possibly the tomb of Louis de Brézé, which his widow Diana of Poitiers, at the time of her extreme grief, caused to be built in the cathedral of Rouen, where it still is.

Germain Pillon executed, in the year of Francis I.'s death, some of the "saints of Soulesmes." To his facile chisel are due the sculptures on the mausoleum of Henry II., which were designed by Philibert Delorme, the tombs of the Chancellor Birague and of William du Bellay, and especially the group of the *Three Graces* cut out of a single block of marble.

Jean Cousin, who was born at Soucy near Sens in 1501, was both a sculptor and a painter. His statue of Admiral Chabot places him on a level with Germain Pillon; he was without a rival in France during the sixteenth century for his windows and oil paintings. Rosso and Primatice, by their grand decorations of the palace of Fontainebleau, "that second Rome," as Vasari calls it, had popularised fresco and oil painting and were imitated by a large number of pupils. Cousin did not learn directly from them, but was doubtless inspired by their work. The windows which he designed for Sens, Metz, and Vincennes place him in the first rank, and more especially his *Legend of St. Eutropius* in the cathedral of Sens. His *Last Judgment*, which is now in the Louvre, is a composition full of fire and of originality, which recalls Michael Angelo by the boldness of its design, its anatomical knowledge, and his richness of imagination. Unfortunately Cousin, like the majority of the great designers, was a poor colourist, especially in his oil painting.

Beside these great names, place must be given to that of the heroic Bernard Palissy. He was a potter, born in Agenois about 1500. After sixteen years of effort and of ruinous expense, he discovered the secret of enamel in 1555, which had been preserved in Italy, and made potteries which are still admired. He was the precursor of Buffon and Cuvier in geology.

Pointed architecture, defeated by the Renaissance, was still trying to uphold itself. There remain curious evidences of this struggle and of the compromise which resulted from it. In St. Eustace at Paris and St. Michael at Dijon it is possible to study that hybrid style which was certainly not without elegance and grandeur.

The church of St. Michael at Dijon was entirely rebuilt between 1499 and 1529, except the towers which were not com-

pleted until the seventeenth century. In its general plan it is an example of the pointed style, but the gateway, constructed by Hugh Sambin of Dijon, the friend and pupil of Michael Angelo, while preserving the innumerable sculptures of the preceding age, yet presents an arch of plain style, and in the towers the four traditional orders. The reconstruction of St. Eustace at Paris began in 1532 and was not completed until 1642. Mansart gave it a heavily designed Greek gateway which happily can hardly be seen; the interior has the most majestic effect.

The Literary Renaissance.—In the fifteenth century literary activity was confined, except in the case of some rare spirits, to the subtleties of scholasticism, expressed in barbarous Latin. The sciences, studied without method, were adventurous and delivered over to superstitious practices. The French language had freshness and force, but lacked amplitude, eloquence, and clearness of expression. Imagination, good sense, and Gallic gaiety appeared in prose and verse, but triviality, diffuseness, and ill-taste disfigured the best books. But antiquity was not rediscovered by the artists alone. The writers also drew from this rich source, and the genius of France, refreshed in this way, acquired that lofty reason, that proportion and limpid clarity which secured for it a peaceful dominion over Europe.

The College of France and the Royal Printers.—Francis I. did not create a movement which was spontaneous in letters any more than in arts; but he assisted it. The old University of Paris, with its faculty of theology, the Sorbonne, could not change its spirit and its method. On the model of the Italian academies and by the advice of the savant Budé, the king founded in 1530 an entirely lay establishment, *the College of the Three Languages*, or the *College of France*. Hebrew, Greek, Latin, medicine, mathematics, philosophy, all that was new or which might be treated in a novel manner, was taught there gratuitously. The Hebraist Vatable, the Hellenist Danès, the mathematician and orientalist Postel, the savant Turnèbe, and the logician Lambin drew to their lectures the pupils to whom the university so sparingly imparted knowledge, and who might hope to hear there Erasmus of Rotterdam, who may in a sense be called the Voltaire of this period. The king offered him the directorship of the new college, but he refused it.

A model printing establishment, rich in characters of all languages, and able to undertake work beyond the scope of private enterprise, was a necessary adjunct to the *College of France*. Francis I. did not create the royal printing press, which

only dates from the reign of Louis XIII. (1640), but he caused the characters of Garamond to be engraved and cast according to the best models of the Venetian type of Aldus Manucius. Garamond, by his orders, entrusted them to the royal printers for use in their best editions. Francis bought manuscripts of ancient authors in Italy, Greece, and Asia, in order to increase the nascent wealth of the royal library, and he caused many to be edited. The family of Estienne acquired a deserved celebrity for the beauty and accuracy of the editions issued by their press.

Scholarship.—Danès, Postel, Dolet, the great Ciceronian Budé, Lefevre d'Étaples, the first Hellenist in Europe, and twenty others edited, with notes and commentaries, a number of works of antiquity both sacred and profane. These indefatigable workers have their place in the civilisation of the world. They appear as pale phantoms, dwelling only with the dead. But it was the rich seed of ancient wisdom which they garnered and spread so freely over new lands. They turned their attention to the roots of civilisation and repaired the broken bonds which united France to the ages of the past and to the great races of mankind. Their learned publications seemed wholly alien from everyday life, but in actual fact they placed in intellectual circulation ideas, knowledge, and types of style which made the renaissance of French literature possible. Already some went far afield and visited Rome and Greece. Postel visited Asia and was acquainted with Hebrew, Arabic, and Armenian. The East was touched upon, though she preserved her mysteries for three centuries longer, to yield them at last in modern times. This contact with antiquity reanimated and strengthened the French national spirit. It supplied the guides and models which had been lacking and enabled it to begin its first great literary age. From this time, it advanced with honour and even with glory over the whole field of literature.

Jurisprudence.—The study of the law surpassed all others in the sixteenth century. The Italian, Alciat, summoned to Bourges by Francis I. in 1529, applied philology to the study of the law. His disciples went further. By means of his erudition the great Cujas restored the text of the Roman jurists and founded the fertile study of the history of law, "that golden hook with which it is possible to seize the true force and knowledge of laws." Pierre Pithou (1596), Denis Godefroy, who published his *Corpus Juris* in 1586, the profound Doneau (1591), and Francis Hottman (1590) rendered other services to the same study. Dumoulin, whom his contemporaries called "the prince of lawyers," was

an advocate of the parliament of Paris and caused the light of French law to arise from the chaos of local customs. Thanks to the work of these men, others such as Ollivier, Michael de l'Hôpital, Harlay, and de Thou, profound jurists or austere and devoted magistrates, were able, in the midst of the most terrible religious discord, to improve the civil law and to prepare the rational unity of French law.

Philosophy.—The Middle Ages were ignorant of Plato; Aristotle reigned without a rival. Ramus, informed by reading the works of the pupil of Socrates, was the first in France to cast off the yoke of superstitious reverence for the Stagirite and his dull commentators. To attack Aristotle through Plato was to substitute one authority for another, but this divided dominion was less burdensome and, wavering between the two masters, human reason began to seek the truth for itself instead of receiving everything from their hands. Ramus had already advised such independent thought: "Why should not discussion be conducted with the freedom of common sense rather than with servile submission to the authority of masters? Why should we not imitate Socrates?" Descartes was Socratic in the following age.

Medicine.—The study of Hippocrates and Galen led to the restoration of the practice of using experience and observation in medicine. Ambrose Paré became the father of French surgery and was a kind of providence to the soldiers at Boulogne, Metz, and St. Quentin. As modest as he was skilful, he said of his patients, "I dress their wounds, God heals them."

Sciences.—In the domain of science France had one great name in this period, that of Viète, who was the precursor of Descartes and Newton, to whom he showed the way in mathematical analysis. In his algebraical calculus he designated known quantities by letters and was thus the founder of the application of algebra to geometry.

Prose Literature.—Literature could not remain unaffected by that Renaissance which appeared in the arts and sciences. But, except in the *Essais* of Montaigne, the matter is better than the form. The age thought much, but language failed it and this lack of accord prevented it from attaining to that harmonious beauty which is found so fully in the art of the period. The *Vie du Chevalier Sans Peur et Sans Reproche*, written by his secretary, the *Loyal Serviteur*, and the memoirs of Fleuranges, the *Jeune Adventureux*, appear as the last echoes of the naïf chronicles of the Middle Ages. The memoirs of the brothers Martin du

Bellay are the instructive work of diplomatists and statesmen, valuable to consult, but monotonous and without spirit. Blaise de Montluc, a fierce Catholic, was not afraid to borrow from Caesar the title of his *Commentaries*, which Henry IV. called the *Soldier's Bible*. The two Tavannes, La Noue, who was a second Bayard, Vieilleville, related their own acts and that which they had seen; others did likewise, and France has in their memoirs one of the most curious forms of historical literature. The prudent de Thou (died 1617) went further in his vast and conscientious *Histoire Universelle*. Brantôme descended to a lower plane in his anecdotes. He was the Suetonius after the Livy of the period, if de Thou, who unfortunately wrote in Latin, may be placed on a level with the great historian of Rome. Brantôme has preserved the *Nouvelles* of the Queen of Navarre and those of Despériers, feeble imitations of the *Decameron* of Boccaccio.

A young man of eighteen, Etienne de la Boétie, in his discourse on *La Servitude Voluntaire* or *Le Contre Un*, written in Bordeaux to the sound of the executions ordered by the fierce Montmorency in 1548, found energetic and burning words in which to scourge tyranny set in the place of government. A little later Jean Bodin (born in 1530) in his work *La Republique*, on the organisation of the state, studied the various forms of polity and sought for the best constitution. The first of these works was no more than a brilliant declamation, the latter only an uncertain sketch.

Michael Eyquem, born at the château of Montaigne in 1533, five leagues from Bergerac, was for five years mayor of Bordeaux (1580). But "he loved too well" to care much for public affairs, the boredom they involved and the dangers which at times were associated with them. When a plague occurred he was the first to fly. That Montaigne was no hero his works clearly reveal. His *Essais* are, from their charm of style and their ingenuity of thought, the most instructive and attractive moral study of man, but their plan is not striking, nor have they that vigorous treatment of subjects and that implacable logic which necessarily result from strong political or religious conviction. They are marked by uncertainty as to right and wrong. "My judgment," he says, "is so evenly balanced with regard to most things that I willingly leave the decision to fate and to the gods." But if he were dubious as to human opinions, he had no doubt as to virtue, though his virtue is pleasant, not austere. "Why is virtue depicted," he asks, "with a pale and forbidding visage? There is nothing more gay, more joyous, even more amusing.

Virtue is not planted, as the Schools teach, at the top of a rugged, barren, inaccessible mountain, on some steep rock, among thorns, a phantom to terrify mankind. It may be attained by fertile, pleasant, sweetly flowering paths." He was right, if on so fair a path virtue were not forgotten. Montaigne went that road, across fertile and flowery plains, and on his way he imitated "the bees who gather here and there among the flowers, making all into honey which is their own; no more thyme or marjoram." Montaigne did likewise with the thoughts and images which he met in the ancient writers; he stole everywhere and made that which he stole his own, with the result that he is an admirable and most reserved talker, a prudent politician who uses the language of the independent philosopher. "Princes do me enough good when they do me no harm." He is even heroic when he displays defeats which are more triumphant than victories; the brave man who remains obstinately courageous, who faced by imminent death loses none of his assurance, who still looks his foe boldly in the face with firm and disdainful gaze, and who is beaten not by man but by fate, who is slain but not vanquished.

The *Essais* of Montaigne were preceded by a translation of the historical and moral works of Plutarch, compiled by Amyot (1513–1593), a translation marked by genius and which gave in French all that ancient science which the philosopher of Cheronea had collected in his books. Montaigne described the work of Amyot as *Our Breviary*.

But the Middle Ages did not give place to the Renaissance without a struggle; the spirit of the old was converted into the new. In the works of Francis Rabelais (1483–1553) the curious struggle between new and old appears. Born at Chinon, first a friar, then a doctor, and finally curé of Meudon, Rabelais in his *Vie de Gargantua et de Pantagruel*, as in his own life, showed a mingling of the most discordant elements, not their harmonious fusion. His book, in which reason speaks the language of folly and laughter is only biting satire, unites the daring thoughts of the Renaissance with the grotesque imaginations of the Middle Ages. Commentators have recognised in the characters of the romance the chief personages of the time, Francis I. as Gargantua, Louis XII. as Grand-Geusior, Henry II. as Pantagruel, the Cardinal of Lorraine as Panurge. Rabelais himself says, "That which we think in lightness of heart must be interpreted in the highest sense." He had clearly no taste for the scaffold or a state prison, but with his wine-stained

face and his fool's bells he talked more freely and boldly than any one.

Drama and Poetry.—A renaissance made by the *savants* and the erudite could owe little of its inspiration to the free and popular spirit of the drama and of poetry. The *Brothers of the Passion* continued with the same courage to hold their everlasting performances, but taste became more severe and piety more enlightened. Material devotion, displayed on the trestles and seasoned by licentiousness, was felt to be an outrage to religion and by an edict of 1548 parliament struck the death-blow of the old mysteries. Popular drama reached its culmination in the *Prince des Sots* and *La Mère Sotte* of Pierre Gringoire. Men were amused by obvious allusions to the people, the Church, to types less generally known, and to prominent individuals. Parliament ended this amusement by an edict of 1536 which forbade the exhibition of any spectacle which alluded to any personage whatsoever. The popular drama was not perfected by the Renaissance, but replaced. Some learned poets had already translated Greek and Latin pieces. Jodelle composed the first regular French tragedy, *Cleopatre*, performed before Henry II. in 1552. With this play, before an audience of courtiers, the modern theatre was born. History took the place of the Bible; the human drama replaced the religious drama. The French theatre preserved from antiquity and from the court in which it originated something traditional, something conventional, which prevented it from acquiring the popularity of the old mysteries.

The poets did not fall so easily. Clement Marot, who died in 1554, introduced at the court, at the risk of unfortunate results, that poetry which Villon had popularised in the Paris streets. At court the poems acquired more delicacy and elegance without losing their vigour and malice. Marot had been a page of Francis I., had fought with him at Pavia, and was there taken prisoner. Having translated the Psalms, he was accused of reformed opinions and persecuted many times, dying in misery at Turin. Boileau urged imitation of Marot's elegant badinage, his verse were full of spirit and grace, but with little force, and his own remark that death would not slay them is true only in some instances.

Ronsard attempted to give French poetry the strength which it lacked by making it Latin and Greek, wasting on this useless attempt the true sensibility of his soul and the real power of his genius. One of his pupils, Joachim du Bellay, sketched in his

Defense et Illustration de la Langue Française (1548) the scheme of that new poetry which Ronsard adopted. Ronsard borrowed not only the ancient forms of the ode and epic poem, their ideas and metaphors, but even their construction of phrases and composition of words. In the dedication of his works to Henry II. he says :

> ". . . C'est, prince, un livre d'odes
> Qu'autrefois je sonnai suivant les vieilles modes,
> D'Horace calabrais et Pindare thébain."

In his *Franciade* he hoped to equal Homer and Virgil, and his age, enamoured of antiquity, almost agreed that he had done so. The most illustrious savants and the most judicious minds, the Scaligers and de Thous, had adoration for him, and Charles IX. wrote to him :

> "Je puis donner la mort; toi, l'immortalité,"

and also,

> "Tous deux également nous portons des couronnes;
> Mais roi, je la reçois; poëte, tu la donnes."

Nothing of Ronsard has remained popular except a few well-turned verses; his only other true title to fame is that he handed down to his successors a greater elevation and nobility, or rather solemnity, of language. He was the founder of the "sublime" style which has remained with us and which so often hides the emptiness of ideas under the magnificence of wording in which those ideas are clothed. Ronsard assembled round him a society of poets, whom he called, in memory of the Alexandrine poets, the *Pleïade*. They were six in number, du Bellay, Baif, Belleau, Jodelle, Jamyn, and Ponthus de Thiard. Another of his disciples, Dubartas, "in whom the French muse spoke Greek and Latin," showed by his very exaggeration in his *Semaine de la Creation* the folly of those innovators who looked ever to the past.

Finally we come to Malherbe who opened the great age of French literature, the seventeenth century.

THE TEMPLE PRESS LETCHWORTH ENGLAND

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY
EDITED BY ERNEST RHYS

HISTORY

DURUY'S HISTORY OF FRANCE

WITH AN APPENDIX (1871–1914)
BY LUCY MENZIES AND AN
INTRODUCTION BY R. WILSON

VOLUME TWO

THIS IS NO. 738 OF *EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY*. THE PUBLISHERS WILL BE PLEASED TO SEND FREELY TO ALL APPLICANTS A LIST OF THE PUBLISHED AND PROJECTED VOLUMES, ARRANGED UNDER THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS:

TRAVEL ❦ SCIENCE ❦ FICTION
THEOLOGY & PHILOSOPHY
HISTORY ❦ CLASSICAL
FOR YOUNG PEOPLE
ESSAYS ❦ ORATORY
POETRY & DRAMA
BIOGRAPHY
REFERENCE
ROMANCE

IN FOUR STYLES OF BINDING: CLOTH, FLAT BACK, COLOURED TOP; LEATHER, ROUND CORNERS, GILT TOP; LIBRARY BINDING IN CLOTH, & QUARTER PIGSKIN

LONDON: J. M. DENT & SONS, LTD.
NEW YORK: E. P. DUTTON & CO.

"CONSIDER HISTORY WITH THE BEGINNINGS OF IT STRETCHING DIMLY INTO THE REMOTE TIME; EMERGING DARKLY OVT OF THE MYSTERIOVS ETERNITY: THE TRVE EPIC POEM AND VNIVERSAL DIVINE SCRIPTVRE. . . ."

CARLYLE

A SHORT HISTORY OF FRANCE: By VICTOR DURUY

VOLUME II

LONDON & TORONTO
PUBLISHED BY J. M. DENT
& SONS LTD & IN NEW YORK
BY E. P. DUTTON & CO

First Issue of this Edition . *November* 1917
Reprinted . . . . *August* 1918

CONTENTS

VOLUME II

ELEVENTH PERIOD—THE WARS OF RELIGION: REVIVAL OF FEUDAL AND COMMUNAL ANARCHY

(1559–1598)

CHAP.		PAGE
XLIII.	Francis II. (1559–1560)	1
XLIV.	Charles IX. (1560–1574)	10
XLV.	Henry III. (1574–1589)	30
XLVI.	The Reign of Henry IV. from 1589–1598	52

TWELFTH PERIOD—RESTORATION OF INTERNAL ORDER BY THE MONARCHY AND THE SECOND STRUGGLE OF FRANCE AGAINST THE HOUSE OF AUSTRIA

(1598–1659)

XLVII.	Reorganisation of France by Henry IV. (1598–1610)	72
XLVIII.	Louis XIII. (1610–1643)	84
XLIX.	Minority of Louis XIV. and the Administration of Mazarin (1643–1661)	113

THIRTEENTH PERIOD—TRIUMPH OF THE ABSOLUTE MONARCHY

(1661–1715)

L.	Louis XIV.: Internal Organisation: Colbert, Louvois, Vauban (1661–1683)	133
LI.	External History and Conquests of Louis XIV. (1661–1679)	151
LII.	Last Period of the Reign of Louis XIV. (1679–1715)	165
LIII.	Government of Louis XIV.	195
LIV.	The Age of Louis XIV.	205

FOURTEENTH PERIOD—THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY: DEVELOPMENT OF ABUSES IN THE MONARCHY: PROGRESS OF PUBLIC OPINION

(1715–1789)

CHAP.		PAGE
LV.	Minority of Louis XV. and Regency of the Duke of Orleans (1715–1723)	222
LVI.	Reign of Louis XV. (1723–1774)	232
LVII.	State of France at the End of the Reign of Louis XV.	261
LVIII.	Reign of Louis XVI. to the Revolution (1775–1789)	281

FIFTEENTH PERIOD—CONSTITUTIONAL FRANCE

(From 1789)

LIX.	The National Assembly of France (1789–1791)	303
LX.	The Legislative Assembly (1791–1792)	328
LXI.	The Convention	336
LXII.	The Directory (October 27, 1795, to November 9, 1799)	354
LXIII.	The Consulate (November 10, 1799, to May 18, 1804)	375
LXIV.	Reign of Napoleon I. till the Peace of Tilsit (1804–1807)	394
LXV.	The Empire from 1807 to 1812	418
LXVI.	The Empire from 1812 to 1814	428
LXVII.	The First Restoration and the Hundred Days (1814–1815)	450
	Summary of the Principal Events from 1815 to 1871	464

APPENDIX

The History of France from 1870 to 1914	513
Index	554

A SHORT HISTORY OF FRANCE

ELEVENTH PERIOD—THE WARS OF RELIGION: REVIVAL OF FEUDAL AND COMMUNAL ANARCHY

(1559–1598)

CHAPTER XLIII

FRANCIS II. (1559–1560)

The Sixteenth Century.—Voltaire, struck by the contrast between the misery and the grandeur of this period, by its artistic glory and by the polish of the court, brilliant even in the midst of crimes, cried, "It was a bloody robe of silk and gold." The silk and gold have already been depicted; it remains to display the blood and ruins.

The Sons of Henry II.—At his death Henry II. left by Catherine de Medici four young sons. Born sickly and early worn out by their excesses, three of these mounted the throne in rapid succession without leaving any direct heirs. As a result, the sceptre of absolute power, so difficult to wield, fell for a quarter of a century into the hands of children or of youths without experience. Grandsons of the most brilliant of French kings, and inheriting the blood of the Medici through their mother, they had time to display excellent mental qualities and grave faults of character. They were eloquent speakers, poets on occasion, always patrons of literature and art. But they were guilty of those vices by which states are ruined, and the crimes to which their treacherous and passionate natures led them have caused their intellectual gifts to be forgotten. The eldest, Francis II., could not escape the evil results of these contradictions in his nature; he reigned—fortunately for his reputation—for less than a year and a half.

Catherine de Medici.—The law fixed the completion of the thirteenth year as the date of a royal majority; at the age of sixteen, Francis II. was still without will power and in tutelage. Under a prince mentally and physically feeble, the queen-mother was naturally possessed of great influence. The widow of Henry II. was as yet unknown. She was supposed to be intelligent but superstitious; to be full of taste for arts and for delicate pleasures, but without moral strength. Her husband had excluded her from all public affairs and so far she had only given evidence of a rare capacity for enduring insults and an infinite address in ordering her conduct in the midst of intrigues. Suddenly transported from the strife of cliques to that of parties, from petty intrigues to civil war, she was unequal to her new rôle. She had intellect but no convictions; she was unscrupulous, and she used the *finesse* of the boudoir in the management of affairs of state. She preferred devious methods to the adoption of a clear and direct policy. She hoped to rule men through their worst passions and thus increased corruption; she tried to play off party against party and thus increased their violence. The long series of outrages which she had endured at the hands of the triumphant Diana of Poitiers destroyed in her mind all sense of the distinction between right and wrong and left in her heart only one respectable emotion, love for her children. All her efforts were directed to preserve power for her sons, and to secure this end she employed without hesitation every means from gallantry to assassination. Her perverse policy became her punishment; in the hands of this Italian the crown of Valois, stained with blood, fell in the mud of the streets and was broken.

Mary Stuart.—It was Mary Stuart, wife of Francis II., who for a time excluded Catherine de Medici from power. Henry II. had married his son to this daughter of James V. and Marie of Lorraine, in order to secure the help of Scotland against England. Beautiful, accomplished, witty, and clever, Mary Stuart had not yet made those mistakes which were followed by so long an expiation, which were atoned by her death. In the brilliant court of France, in the midst of *savants*, poets, and artists, all of whom were her servants, she enjoyed without thought of the future the seductive influence of her wit and beauty, which even to-day arrests hard words on the lips of the historian. The influence of the young queen and the ascendancy which she held over the king might have resulted in good for the state if she had been surrounded by able advisers, but she concerned herself only with amusements and committed

all affairs to the care of her two uncles, the Cardinal of Lorraine and Duke Francis of Guise.

Aspirants to Power.—The family of Guise, a younger branch of the ducal house of Lorraine, though but recently introduced into France, had risen rapidly. Claude, its chief, had secured in return for his service the government of Champagne and the erection of his territory of Guise into a duchy; his brother John had become a cardinal. Two of his sons were destined to play a great part. The eldest, Francis, had defended Metz and recovered Calais; another, Charles, had succeeded to the cardinalate of his uncle John, and eventually secured possession of twelve sees, including three archbishoprics. The young king confided to Francis "all that concerned the militia," while Charles had charge of civil affairs. The whole administration of the country was thus placed in their hands, though Catherine de Medici held "the general superintendence of the government"; a high-sounding title but nothing more.

There were other aspirants to power, some on the score of birth, others from ambition. These were the Bourbon princes and the family of Montmorency. The chiefs of the Bourbon family at that time were Anthony, who had married Jeanne d'Albret, heiress of the kingdom of Navarre, and his two brothers, Charles, Cardinal of Bourbon, and Louis, Prince of Condé. They were the nearest relatives of the Valois, and in event of a minority Anthony might claim the regency. But since the treason of the Constable, the Bourbons had been in disgrace and for the time being they demanded nothing.

The stern old Constable Montmorency, who had been defeated at St. Quentin, was less disinterested, but the king declared that, out of consideration for his age, he would relieve him of the burden of office. The two Guises thus remained masters of the king, of the court, and of power, but a new enemy arose against them.

Calvin: Progress of the Reformation.—Forty years had passed since Luther began to preach against the Church and Europe was already divided into two communions. All the north, England, Scotland, Sweden, Denmark, half Germany, and Switzerland, were separated from Rome, while the south, Italy and Spain, remained obedient to her. If France went over to the side of the Reformation its triumph would be complete, and hence the great dispute which followed in that land possessed a European importance.

Under Francis I. and Henry II. the Sorbonne had condemned

the new opinions without consenting to discuss them. Preaching in rural districts had been forbidden by the parliament, the death penalty had been decreed against heretics, and the establishment of an inquisitorial tribunal for clerks had been sanctioned. Numerous *autos-de-fé*[1] at Paris, Toulouse, Vienne, and Montpellier, and the execution of the Vaudois, sufficed to indicate that the government, if in its foreign policy it supported Protestants, had no intention of making any concession to them at home.

The French reformers had so far been without guidance. Calvin supplied this want. He was the son of a notary of Noyon, where he was born on July 10, 1509. At the age of twelve he had been provided with a benefice in the cathedral of that town; at the age of eighteen, he obtained a parish without taking orders. But becoming acquainted at the University of Bourges with heretical opinions, he adopted and modified them, personally preached them at Poitiers, Paris, and Nérac, and was the first to explain and to defend them in a lucid and methodical manner in a work which he entitled *The Institutions of the Christian Religion*. He prefaced this book with an eloquent address to Francis I. He attacked the supremacy of the holy see, the authority of general councils, the episcopal and priestly offices, the real presence, and the adoration of saints. After many wanderings he settled at Geneva, where he secured such influence that his word was obeyed rather than the commands of the magistrates. From 1541–1564 he reigned as an absolute master, regulating doctrines and reforming manners; he was severe to the point of cruelty, causing a writer of libertine verses to be condemned to death, as he caused Michael Servetus to be burned for denying the dogma of the Trinity, and he showed that in an age of earnest belief the persecuted will be not less intolerant than the persecutors. Under the guidance of this austere and pitiless legislator the Reformation in France secured definition; it diverged farther than that of Luther, since it denied absolutely the real presence in the sacrifice of the mass, and proscribed as abominations all the splendours of the Catholic faith. The Reformation in France became Calvinism, and Geneva became the Rome of Protestantism. The Calvinists or Huguenots (probably a corruption of *eidgenossen*, confederates) increased in the midst of persecution. The Council of Trent (1545) and the new religious order of the Society of Jesus, created explicitly to

[1] A Spanish term meaning the execution of a sentence pronounced by the Inquisition.

combat heresy, were powerless to arrest its progress. "In spite of edicts, in spite of executions," says the Catholic Michael de Castelnau, a great friend of the Guises, "they are so obstinate and so resolute in their religion that, however determined authority may be to put them to death, they will not for that abandon their meetings; the more they are punished the more their numbers increase." Tumultuous and bloody scenes had already occurred in Paris, and this fact explains the hurried peace of Cateau-Cambrésis. The two kings felt that it was more important for them to check the progress of heresy than to take a few more towns. By a secret convention arranged by the Guises and Granville, or at least by formal promises, Philip II. and Henry II. undertook to extirpate heresy.

Execution of Anne Dubourg.—Henry at once engaged on this work, publishing the Edict of Écouen, which imposed the death penalty upon Protestants and their accomplices (June, 1559). Hearing that the Huguenots had found defenders even in the courts of justice, he appeared in the parliament of Paris some days before the fatal tournament and ordered it to continue the debate on this edict in his presence. Two members, Dufaur and Anne Dubourg, did not conceal their sympathy with the persecuted; the latter even assumed the part of an accuser. "I know," he said, "that certain crimes must be pitilessly punished, such as adultery, blasphemy, and perjury. But of what are those accused who are condemned to the stake?" The king conceived that he was insulted and defied to the face; he at once caused them to be seized and commanded their trial to begin. His death did not stop the case, which continued in the midst of the most violent agitation. The ministers of the reformed church held their first synod at Paris in order to draw up a petition in favour of the accused. Between five and six in the evening of December 12, 1559, the president, Minard, a violent enemy of Dubourg, was shot as he left the meeting. This shot was the death-sentence of Dubourg, who was burned on the Place de Grève.

Power of the Reformed Party: Political Discontent.—But the reformers organised their forces. The ministers of the national synod availed themselves of the presence of the reformers at Paris to form the basis of a union of their churches and to establish relations with the German Protestants. Some great personages were already included in their party, which was increased not only by those who formed a religious, but also by those who formed a political, opposition. The princes of the blood, Anthony of Bourbon and Condé, were angered by their

exclusion from the government. The higher nobility saw power in the hands of foreigners, of a Scottish queen, an Italian queen-mother, and of the Guises, the Lorraines, with annoyance. The last secured everything in France, even that which the nobles valued more than political power, the privileges of *etiquette*, for they claimed as foreign princes to walk immediately behind the princes of the blood, before the heads of the most illustrious families. The lesser nobility of the provinces had not received, in compensation for their privileges which monarchical power had abolished, places and honours; these were reserved exclusively for the nobles who followed the court, and they leaned towards theological innovations as a result of their political discontent. A certain section were favourably impressed by the austere and independent doctrines of Calvinism; some could not refrain from thinking of the rich domains of the Church which the lords in Germany and England had secularised, and of their privileges which they might possibly recover in the general confusion; these dangerous thoughts greatly assisted conversion. When the civil wars are carefully considered it will be seen that all these grounds of discontent, all these vague hopes, combined together to destroy both the old religious system and the new political system.

Conspiracy of Amboise (1560).—The two Guises, the duke and the cardinal, harsh and proud, were just the men to precipitate a crisis. They exercised their power with arrogance and partiality. They suppressed the titles and pensions of their opponents in order to lavish them on their friends. They disbanded the old regiments in which a number of poor gentlemen served and replaced them by Germans and Italians, who were more devoted to the Guises. Many who had made the Italian campaigns at their own expense came to Fontainebleau to seek indemnity and rewards. The Cardinal of Lorraine caused a gallows to be erected at the door of the château and ordered all such applicants to leave the town within twenty-four hours under penalty of being arrested.

This dexterous method of balancing accounts caused righteous indignation; many men threw themselves into a conspiracy, as they were not yet able to throw themselves into a civil war. They fancied that they could count on the two Bourbons, and were at least sure of Condé; they expected that they would easily win over the three Châtillons, nephews of Montmorency, one of whom was Cardinal-Bishop of Beauvais, another, Coligny, was Admiral of France, long an enemy of Duke Francis, and the third, Dandelot,

was colonel-general of the infantry. Coligny was said to have told the king that he would rather die than go to mass.

It was proposed to seize the king, that by taking him out of the power of the Guises the authority of the latter might be destroyed. The Prince of Condé was the secret leader of the conspirators, but the enterprise was entrusted to a man of determined character, La Renaudie, a gentleman of Limousin. It was arranged that a certain number of Huguenots should go to Blois, where the court then was, to demand religious liberty; La Renaudie, at the head of five hundred well-armed gentlemen and of a thousand soldiers, was to follow them and effect a *coup*. Calvin, vaguely consulted as to the attempt, expressed his vigorous disapproval: "If a single drop of blood be shed, all the rivers of Europe will be bloodstained." All was ready, when an advocate, who had at first heartily approved of the plan, revealed it all through fear.

Francis of Guise removed the court to the château of Amboise, which lent itself better to defence, ordered Condé and the Châtillon brothers to come to the king's service, and by an edict suspended the persecution of the reformers in order to divide his opponents. La Renaudie would not abandon his enterprise. On March 16 he marched upon Amboise; being surprised in the forest of Château-Renaud, he was killed. The Duke of Guise, nominated lieutenant-general of the kingdom with unlimited powers, showed himself merciless. He caused the conspirators, who had been dispersed, to be collected by bodies of troops, and for a month they were beheaded, hanged, or drowned. The court, including even the ladies, assisted at the executions, but they heard terrible threats. One day, a gentleman, M. de Villemongris, who was reserved as the last to be executed, dipped his hands in the blood of his companions and raising them to Heaven cried, "Lord, behold the blood of thy children and avenge it."

"The chief mute," Condé, whom no one had seen but of whom every one talked, was compromised by the evidence of many prisoners. He declared that all who had been hanged had lied, but no one doubted that he was the author of the plot. As he had committed nothing to writing, and as he had shown himself to no one except to La Renaudie, who was dead, he loudly demanded a solemn assembly of the princes, and defied to single combat any one who dared to accuse him. The Duke of Guise had no sufficient proofs; as he was unable to destroy Condé, he wished to appear to save him. He offered to act as his second,

and when this was known, no one dared accept the challenge. Guise waited for Condé to commit some new blunder.

The Chancellor l'Hôpital : Edict of Romorantin (1560).—The Guises had gained one of those victories which weaken the victors. All these executions on account of a plot which it would have been easy to counter, created horror. The Chancellor Ollivier died crying to the Guises in his agony, "Cardinal, thanks to you, we are damned." The Duchess of Guise fled in terror. "Ah, madame," she cried to the queen, "who can doubt that after this some great misfortune will fall upon our house?" Mary Stuart was not troubled; her precocious intellect had misled her heart. But the young king wept and remarked that the name heard most often in the curses of the condemned was not his but that of his uncles. The queen-mother understood popular sentiment even better, that "there was in all this more political discontent than Huguenotism." She gave the seals to Michel de l'Hôpital. He was "one of the best souls struck from the mould of antiquity, another Cato the Censor; he looked his part, with his long white beard, his pale face, his grave manner." The new chancellor rendered an initial service to France. The Guises, exalted by their success, demanded the introduction of the Inquisition, pure and simple. "What need is there," said l'Hôpital, "for so many butchers, so many tortures? Full of virtue and protected by good morals, heresy can be resisted." But he caused the Edict of Romorantin to be published (May, 1560), which gave information in cases of heresy to a tribunal of bishops, a great concession to the clergy, but preferable to the establishment of that terrible tribunal which then filled Spain with butchers and roused the horror even of the Italian Catholics.

Preparations for Civil War.—In order to combat the Guises, l'Hôpital needed some ground of support. He assembled the notables at Fontainebleau. Coligny appeared, fell on his knees before the king, and presented to him the petition of the Huguenots of Normandy, who demanded liberty of conscience. The Cardinal of Lorraine opposed this concession. But Montluc, Bishop of Valence, and Marillac, Archbishop of Vienne, secured the suspension of all persecution until the meeting of the States-General. It was decided that the States should assemble on December 10, 1560. It was needful that the voice of the people should be raised above the tumult of rival ambitions and conflicting creeds. The Guises had allied themselves to the merciless policy of the King of Spain, who wrote to them, "If you wish to chastise rebels, I am at your disposal," and they

gathered an army. The two Bourbons and the Châtillons levied troops of gentlemen, and with the help of an agent of Calvin, they organised resistance in the provinces of the south. At many points conflicts had already occurred.

Arrest of Condé: Death of Francis II. (1560).—In the midst of this disturbance the deputies of the States arrived at Orleans. The King of Navarre and the Prince of Condé appeared despite the advice of their friends. The Guises, who now had proofs against Condé, caused him to be arrested as soon as he entered the town and in order to free themselves from his brother, against whom they could prove nothing, they proposed to murder him in the royal antechamber. The king's heart failed him; he dared not give the signal. This idea of assassination was destined to turn one day against those who had formed it; the two Guises fell in this same way. But a commission was appointed to carry through the trial of Condé with all haste; the fate of the prince was determined beforehand; he was condemned to death and would have perished had not l'Hôpital refused to sign the sentence and gained some respite for him. To gain time was to gain life for Condé, for the young king was on his deathbed. He expired on December 5, after a reign of seventeen months.

France would soon have forgotten this unhappy young man if his reign had not been associated with two memories, the one terrible—the power of the Guises and the beginning of the wars of religion; the other touching—that of young Mary Stuart. Forced by the death of her husband to abandon the land of her adoption in order to return to her savage Scotland, she wept long at leaving France, where "misfortune had left her and good fortune had taken her by the hand." Supported on the poop of her galley, her eyes full of tears fixed on the horizon, she remained, says Brantôme, for five hours in that attitude, repeating incessantly, "Adieu, France! Adieu, France!" When night came she caused a hammock to be stretched in the same place and lay there, refusing all food. At daybreak she could still see a point on the horizon, and cried, "Adieu, dear France. I shall never see you more." She went to find a crown; she also found chains and a captivity of eighteen years; where she looked for a throne she found a scaffold.

CHAPTER XLIV

CHARLES IX. (1560–1574)

Regency of Catherine de Medici: The States of Orleans (1560).—The death of Francis II. deprived the queen-mother of one of her children, but it gave her power, since her second son, Charles IX., was only ten and a half years old. She took the regency and, abandoning all violent measures, such as had hitherto been the rule, confirmed the Guises in their offices, but at the same time she appointed Anthony of Bourbon lieutenant-general of the kingdom and released Condé. Her chief adviser was l'Hôpital, who proposed to hold the ambitious in check and to weaken the factions by the adoption of a sage religious toleration and by civil reforms. Catherine adopted this statesmanlike programme; she saw in the scheme by which the chancellor hoped to extinguish party strife a means by which she might set faction against faction.

The Guises, fearing that they would not command a sufficient majority in the States which were on the point of meeting, wished to send the deputies home on the ground that the death of the king invalidated their powers and that the States were in any case a dangerous institution. The chancellor answered that royal authority did not die, since the power of the dead passed at once to his heir, and that "it was an act as worthy of the king's dignity to hold the States, as it was to give audience to each individual and render justice to them."

The States did not render those services which l'Hôpital had expected. The debt amounted to 43,480,000 livres, which would amount to-day to 350,000,000 francs, while the annual revenue was only 12,260,000 francs. The king was, indeed, as the chancellor declared him to be, "the most embarrassed and indebted orphan that one could find in any rank or condition of life." The nobles offered nothing; the clergy, who since the reign of Francis I. had granted tithes almost annually, agreed to supply a free gift of 1,600,000 livres for six years, and to redeem in ten years 630,000 livres of interest on a capital of 7,560,000 livres. The third estate, which bore the weight of taxation, demanded its reduction, the abolition of the sale of offices, of internal customs barriers, and the assembling of the States every five years. On the religious problem the three

orders were divided. The clergy desired the extermination of heresy; the third estate desired toleration of worship; the nobles were divided in opinion.

Measures of l'Hôpital: Ordinance of Orleans (1561).—The chancellor acted with resolution, hoping to induce the nation to follow him. He restored the balance between expenditure and revenue by reforms in the royal household and by the reduction of pensions by one-third. The Edict of Romorantin was confirmed and royal letters (January, 1561) ordered the suspension of all prosecutions on religious grounds. Three days later the famous Ordinance of Orleans appeared, which restored canonical elections, forbade exactions for the administration of the sacraments, insisted on residence of the clergy, and, completing the reform initiated by Louis XII., definitely withdrew the administration of justice from the bailiffs and seneschals, who were generally soldiers ignorant of law, and transferred it to their lieutenants, who were to be members of the legal profession or of the judicature. There were three great benefits to the state in this: the first application of the principle of toleration, a reform in the administration of justice, and a reform of the discipline of the Gallican Church. The Duke of Guise, Marshal St. André, and Montmorency, threatened with the danger of having to refund the sums which they had extorted from the easy generosity of previous kings, left the court and formed a secret alliance, the *Triumvirate*, to defend their money and the cause of religion, which they declared to be in peril.

Edict of July: States of Pontoise (1561).—L'Hôpital did not allow himself to be turned from the course which he was pursuing. By the Edict of July, he declared preaching to be illegal, but also granted a general amnesty and suspended the execution of any sentence passed on the ground of religion until the meeting of a general council. At the States of Orleans it had been agreed that thirty commissioners from each order should meet with full powers to decide the question of subsidies. The chancellor assembled them at Pontoise (August). At the same time he called a conference of the theologians of the two creeds at Poissy that they might, if possible, arrange a compromise which should end disputes. The States, in which there were many Calvinists, demanded that they should be summoned every two years, that religious toleration should be established, that judicial and financial offices should be reformed and converted into mere commissions for three years, and, finally, to extinguish the national debt

they demanded that the goods of the Church should be sold to the estimated value of 120,000,000 livres, the clergy being compensated by pensions, an idea which was eventually adopted at the time of the Revolution. The clergy could only parry this blow by offering to free the state from the loans secured on the *aides, gabelles,* and *demesnes* by means of an annual gift of 1,600,000 livres for nine years. "This undertaking we still carry out," said Abbé Marly in 1789.

Conference of Poissy (1561).—The conference at Poissy had no such good results. It was opened by l'Hôpital with a serious speech. "We have behaved," he said, "like bad generals, who advance to attack the enemy leaving their camp denuded and undefended; we ought to fight with the weapons of charity, prayer, persuasion, and the word of God, which are suitable for the conflict in which we are engaged." He added, "Abandon those devilish words, nicknames of parties and watchwords of sedition, Lutherans, Huguenots, Papists; do not alter the one name of Christian." The conference began well, the Catholic doctors allowing Theodore Beza to expound his doctrine. But when he denied the real presence in the Eucharist the whole assembly groaned. The Cardinal of Lorraine cried out against the abominations which he was hearing. Lainez, general of the Jesuits, one of those present, opposed the queen by claiming for the pope alone the right of deciding on religious disputes, and he caused the rapid dissolution of the meeting.

Edict of January in Favour of the Calvinists (1562).—But the queen supported the chancellor, and even went further than he did. Her letters to the pope demanded great reforms in discipline and ceremonies; she allowed l'Hôpital to issue the Edict of January (1562), by which Calvinism was authorised in the rural districts and forbidden in walled towns, all penalties against heresy were suspended; the Calvinists were forbidden to trouble the ancient faith, to hold assemblies, or to raise troops, but the authorities were ordered to protect them in the free exercise of their religion. This was the first real measure of toleration. The government acted as Castelnau describes in his *Mémoires.* "Since no progress had been made in France against the Lutherans, by death, fire, and other penalties, during a period of thirty years, the experiment of adopting another method was tried; an attempt made to gain something by gentleness."

Impatience of the Parties.—Mercy, unhappily, was hardly appreciated amid the passions of the time. The more tolerant the government, the more violent the mutual hatred of Catholics

and Protestants. The monks, and still more the Jesuits, whose legal existence had been for two years recognised in France, exalted the fervour of the faithful and excited them to undertake the defence of religion which the queen had abandoned. The Cardinal of Lorraine and the doctors of the Sorbonne secretly implored the help of Philip II., who made threatening representations to Catherine. The Protestants on their side, believing that their cause was victorious, were not content with what had been granted to them, but aimed at overstepping the limits of the January edict.

Agrippa d'Aubigné, a man of vigorous spirit, a character reminiscent of past ages, related that some time after the executions he passed through the town of Amboise with his father and saw the corpses of the slain still hanging from the gallows. His father bared his head before these mutilated remains, pointing to them and crying, in the midst of the crowd, "The executioners have decapitated France." Then, placing his right hand on his son's head, he threatened him with his curse if he ever deserted the holy cause of these martyrs. "My child, neither your head nor mine must be spared in order to win vengeance for these chiefs, full of honour." These men had souls of iron like their armour.

While the reformers gave such lessons to their children it is hardly surprising that there were disputes and quarrels on every side. One day l'Hôpital, answering the calumnies with which he was assailed, spoke these fine words: "I know well that I speak the truth when I say that I will not be defeated by the hatred of those who despise my old age. I would pardon them their impatience if they could gain by a change. But when I look all round me I am greatly tempted to answer them, as did a saintly old bishop who had, like me, a long white beard. He pointed to it, saying, 'When this snow has been melted there will be nothing but mud.'" L'Hôpital used the wrong word; he should have said, "blood," for it was blood that was about to flow.

Massacre of Vassy (1562).—"The clergy, part of the nobility, and almost all the people," says Castelnau, "considered that the Cardinal of Lorraine and the Duke of Guise were veritably called by God to preserve the Catholic religion." At this time they had that interview with the Count of Würtemberg at Saverne, of which so strange an account is extant. They were recalled to Paris by St. André and the King of Navarre, who had abandoned Calvinism in the hope of securing from Philip II.

the restoration of his little kingdom, that they might oppose l'Hôpital. On March 1, 1562, the Duke of Guise passed through Vassy in Champagne. It was a Sunday, and he halted to hear mass. He heard the hymns of some six or seven hundred Protestants who were assembled in a neighbouring barn. Some of his men wished to silence a noise which they declared to be an injury and defiance of their duke ; when the Protestants refused to stop they attacked them sword in hand. The others defended themselves with stones. The Duke of Guise, hastening to the support of his men, was struck on the cheek ; his men at once fell upon the unarmed wretches, killed sixty and wounded more than two hundred, making no distinction of age or sex. Some days later others were massacred at Sens, of which the Cardinal of Lorraine was archbishop, as they returned from hearing a preacher.

First Civil War (1562).—This was the signal for the outbreak of a war which, seven times interrupted by precarious truces, always began again and which for thirty-two years covered France with blood and ruins. At the news of the massacre of Vassy, the Huguenots everywhere took up arms ; the Duke of Guise forcibly removed the king and his mother from Fontainebleau and transferred them to Paris, where there were not many Protestants. Castelnau says that the strength of the reformers there consisted only of three hundred gentlemen, experienced soldiers, more than four hundred students, and some of the bourgeoisie, volunteers without experience ; "and what could they avail against an innumerable people ? It was the contest of a mouse against an elephant." But outside Paris the Huguenots were supposed to number one-tenth of the population, and they had the greater part of the rural nobility on their side.

They proclaimed Condé defender of the king and protector of the kingdom ; in some weeks they captured more than two hundred towns, among which were Rouen, Lyons, Tours, Montpellier, Poitiers, Grenoble, Orleans, and Blois. The Guises had not expected such prompt action ; they were ill-prepared, but they had the king in their power. They declared the Calvinists to be rebels and Condé guilty of high treason. Philip II., the champion of Catholicism throughout Europe, gave them a force of 3000 Spanish veterans, men of cold and fierce bravery. Condé, on his side, had recourse to the Protestant Elizabeth, who sent him soldiers to defend Rouen, on condition that Havre was handed over to her as security for the sums which she advanced. Thus both parties were guilty of appealing to the foreigner.

Montluc and Baron des Adrets.—In the south war broke out everywhere at once without order or plan, according to the promptings of hatred and vengeance. City attacked city, château attacked château, house attacked house. At Toulouse the Calvinists had seized the Capitol; there they were besieged by the parliament and a battle occurred which lasted for eight days. At Montpellier, Baron Crussol, in order to defend the place against the Catholics, caused all the suburbs to be destroyed, including six beautiful convents, four churches, and the tower of the university. Predatory bands ranged over the rural districts, robbing and plundering; Protestants slew as well as Catholics; but the Protestants also destroyed churches, desecrated tombs, and broke statues. Many masterpieces perished at that time, and the churches of France still bear traces of these devastations. Two party leaders distinguished themselves above all others for their cruelty: the Catholic Blaise de Montluc, the royalist butcher in Languedoc and Guienne; and the Protestant des Adrets in Provence and Dauphiné. The former was always accompanied by two executioners, whom he called his lacqueys; one day he strangled with his own hands a Protestant minister who had come to negotiate with him. "He was not mild," he says of himself, "but contrary to his natural manner, he practised not merely severity, but cruelty." One day he killed between thirty and forty men on a road; on another occasion he hanged seventy to the pillars of a hall, "which caused great fear in the country, since one hanging has more effect than a hundred shootings." Holding this opinion, he increased the number of hangings. "It is easy to tell where I have passed, for the signs appear on the trees by the roadside." These cruelties made him master of Guienne, which he held by controlling the Garonne and the Dordogne.

Baron des Adrets secured a like reputation by similar acts. After the capture of Montbrison he caused half the defenders of the place to be executed and compelled the rest to throw themselves off a high tower on to the pikes of his soldiers.

Siege of Rouen (1562).—The leaders of the two parties were in the north; there the war was more systematic and its issue was decided. At the head of a Catholic army, which Anthony of Bourbon joined, the Duke of Guise advanced upon Rouen. That city, dominated from the neighbouring heights, was not tenable; but it resisted all the same. Anthony of Bourbon was mortally wounded, and at the end of some days the place was taken. Montaigne relates that at this siege a Protestant gentleman was

found who was charged with the task of murdering Guise. The duke pardoned him. "For," he said, "I wish you to know that the religion which I hold is much more gentle than that which you profess; *yours* counsels you to kill me without hearing me, having received no injury from me; *mine* orders me to pardon you, though wholly convinced that you wished to slay me without reason." Such fine words are often on the lips of the ambitious, who desire every kind of glory and sometimes achieve it, but whose lives belie them. The duke who was now so magnanimous had not been so at Vassy or at Amboise, where he replied to one of his victims, "My business is not to speak but to cut off heads." He was not altogether magnanimous even at Rouen. "That great city," says Castelnau, "full of every kind of wealth, was pillaged for eight days, with no regard for either religion. And that notwithstanding the fact that it had been proclaimed on the morrow of its fall that every company and regiment of whatever nationality should leave the city under pain of death." After the pillage of the town came judicial executions and the war assumed that character of cruelty which is characteristic of all civil wars.

Battle of Dreux (1562).—Condé, with a reinforcement of 7000 men which he had received from Germany, tried to repair the loss of Rouen by an attack on the suburbs of Paris. Repulsed by the Spaniards, he retired to Havre, where he was joined by the English. He again advanced in greater strength, but was stopped on his return by the Duke of Guise neur Dreux (December, 1562). Fifteen or sixteen thousand men were engaged on either side. "Every one," says La Noue, "felt that those who were attacking were not Italians or Spaniards, but Frenchmen, brave men indeed, among whom might be their own companions, relations, and friends. Each thought that in an hour he would be driven to kill them, and thus the conflict became horrible, though the courage of the two armies was unimpaired." Condé forced the centre of the Catholics, wounded the constable and took him prisoner. But the Swiss resumed the battle, and the Duke of Guise completed the victory by a flank attack, Condé being captured.

Death of the Duke of Guise (February, 1563).—Guise had gained a great success. Of the two who might dispute his influence, one, St. André, was killed and the other, Montmorency, was a prisoner, while he himself held the leader of the Huguenots captive. He treated Condé chivalrously, wished him to share his bed, and slept well beside his mortal foe, who vowed

that he had been unable to close his eyes. Catherine de Medici had been told that the battle was lost; she answered calmly, "Very well, then; we will pray to God in French." The Guises terrified her; when she learned the truth, they terrified her still further, despite the joy which she affected to feel at their success. She talked of negotiating and issued a decree of amnesty for all those who laid down their arms. But Guise did not intend to spare those whom he had beaten; he pressed his victory with energy and besieged Orleans in order to cut the communications between the northern and southern Protestants. But for a fanatical crime the city would not have resisted long. A Protestant, Poltrot de Méré, excited by the examples of Judith and Deborah, Ehud and Jael, entered the camp of Guise as a deserter, and finding the duke alone one evening, mortally wounded him with a pistol shot.

Guise was a great commander. France owed Calais to him; he had held Metz for her. But she owed him also the wars of religion which checked her progress by thirty years of blood and ruin. It cannot be asserted dogmatically that the wars could have been avoided. Yet had Guise possessed less weight in the government, l'Hôpital might have developed the wise policy which was embodied in the Edict of Amboise and afterwards in that of Nantes. It would, indeed, have been impossible to tolerate those madmen who regarded as a meritorious act the killing of any one who prayed to God otherwise than as they prayed; toleration was to such men a meaningless word. But a policy which was impossible after Vassy and Amboise and Orleans might have been possible before. Blood cried out for blood; slaughter continued because slaughter had begun. And the guilt rested with the man who began.

Peace and Edict of Amboise (March, 1563).—Guise being dead, Condé and Montmorency prisoners, the queen-mother remained mistress of the government. She saw clearly that the party leaders, while no doubt desiring the triumph of their respective creeds, desired still more the acquisition of power. She realised that civil war would ruin respect for royal authority. When Montluc mentioned Charles IX. to some Huguenot gentlemen as the king, they answered, "What king? We are all kings and he whom you mention is only a little kinglet; we will whip him and make him get his living like the rest." The peasants in turn refused to pay their ancient dues to the gentlemen. "Show us from the Bible whether we ought to pay or not," they said. "If our ancestors have been beasts and fools, we do not wish to be

like them." The whole structure of society was crumbling. To end the agitation Catherine offered peace to Condé; he signed it at Amboise, in return for an edict which authorised the reformed worship in the houses of nobles, in the demesnes of lords having rights of justice, and in one town in each bailiwick.

Recovery of Havre (1563).—To demonstrate the reality of their union, Catholics and Protestants made a common expedition against Havre, which the English wished to retain and which they valued more than Calais. "All were eager to do well; even those who were most favoured at the court, despising all danger, were found in the trenches." The town, skilfully attacked and badly defended, opened its gates at the end of some days. The clergy paid the cost of this expedition, handing over goods to the value of 450,000 livres.

Philip II. and the Court of Catherine de Medici.—The Council of Trent, assembled in order to restore peace to Christendom, had failed to do so. At this period, no one understanding religion as a matter of conscience between God and man, each wished to secure the triumph of the creed he held, aiding that triumph by arms and butchery. Philip II., King of Spain, employed all his forces and staked the whole future of his monarchy in this cause. He stifled heresy in Italy and Spain; he proposed to stifle it also in the Low Countries, in England, and in France. The Guises shared in his plans; and when their great leader was dead, Philip tried to secure Catherine herself.

She had honestly carried out the Treaty of Amboise, but the extremists of the two parties did not accept this compromise. The parliament long refused to register the edict of pacification; Tavannes would not carry it out in his government of Burgundy; Coligny reproached Condé "with having ruined the churches by a stroke of the pen, a result which all the forces of the enemy would not have been able to accomplish in ten years." Private animosities blazed forth; assassination took the place of civil war. Catherine tried to distract the gentlemen from these fierce passions, increasing fêtes and temptations at her court, "flowers of pleasure stained with blood." Manners became worse and peace was no better secured.

Conference of Bayonne (1535).—The queen, though satisfied with the decline of the Guises, found the Bourbons too powerful. As she had already, when faced by the great Guise, leaned towards the reformers, so in face of Condé she leaned towards the Catholics. She gradually diminished the liberties which had been granted to the Protestants at Amboise. Crimes committed

against them were not investigated. In a progress which she made with Charles IX. through the provinces of the south and during which she was able to see that the bulk of the people were still Catholic, she removed governors who were suspected of Calvinism and caused citadels to be built in the cities where that religion was predominant. The journey ended at Bayonne (June, 1535) in a conference with the Duke of Alva, the most terrible instrument of the will of Philip II., who, like his master, believed in the lawfulness of useful crimes. The Protestants were easily convinced that an alliance between the two crowns, concluded under the auspices of such a man, could have no other object than the extirpation of heresy and from that time the sword hardly remained sheathed.

After Philip II., the holy see was distressed by the temporising policy of Catherine. A rigid pope, Pius V., had ascended the throne of St. Peter, and as pontiff he continued that war against the new doctrines which he had begun as Grand Inquisitor. A numerous militia, the Jesuits, fought throughout Europe with enthusiasm and intelligence for the Catholic cause. They preached to the people, instructed the young, and waged against heresy a constant and mortal combat. The time for negotiation was passed.

Ordinance of Moulins (1566).—One man still hoped. L'Hôpital had taken for his motto those beautiful verses of Horace which accorded so well with his stoical temper in the midst of the miseries of his age :

> *" Si fractus illabatur orbis,*
> *Impavidum ferient ruinae."*

In the midst of such preparations for war, in the midst of such bloody expectations, the illustrious chancellor continued his reforms. In 1566, as a last protest against these furies, he issued his Ordinance of Moulins for the general reform of justice. It declared the royal demesne to be " inalienable and imprescriptible " ; fixed the method of nomination and examination of judges in order to minimise the evils of the sale of offices ; restrained the privileges of officials of the crown ; deprived towns of civil jurisdiction and left them only the care of local police ; and submitted the lower courts to inspection by the higher. In short, it brought the state nearer to centralisation of authority, justice, and procedure. His efforts failed to profit his contemporaries, though succeeding ages profited from them. Some of the rules for civil procedure which l'Hôpital laid down

still maintain. Noble souls find their recompense sooner or later. Their immediate reward is found in the satisfaction of their own conscience; their ultimate reward is granted to them by posterity.

Second Civil War (1567–1568).—Meanwhile the Protestants, threatened by the court, renewed their meetings, amassed money, and prepared armies. Catherine reorganised the royal forces by raising 6000 men in Switzerland. The Duke of Alva was in the Low Countries with considerable forces which were intended for use against the Protestants of Holland and France. The reformers, in order to anticipate their enemies, formed a new conspiracy of Amboise. The court was at Monceaux in Brie, and on September 27, 1567, a body of 500 gentlemen appeared near that place. Catherine had only time to take refuge in Meaux, from which place the court regained Paris, under the protection of the Swiss infantry.

Battle of St. Denis (1567).—The *coup* had failed; war was inevitable. Condé dared to blockade Paris, and the inhabitants compelled the aged Montmorency to repulse him. The constable, says Brantôme, "was a great despiser of persons, having on his lips only such words as 'ass' and 'sot'; he was brave and bore the marks of seven wounds." He was also an extremely incapable general, his plan of campaign was bad, and he was killed—at the age of seventy-seven. The battle was indecisive; if the Catholics held the field, the Huguenots were at any rate able on the following day to offer battle again, which the Catholics declined.

Catherine de Medici rejoiced over this battle as a victory. "I am under two great obligations to Heaven," she declared, "the first, that the constable has avenged the king on his enemies; the second, that the enemies of the king have taken vengeance on the constable." Marshal Vieilleville had a more just appreciation of the event when he said to the king, "Your Majesty has not gained a battle, still less has the Prince de Condé done so; the victor is the King of Spain, since on one side and the other there have died enough valiant captains and enough brave French soldiers to have conquered Flanders and all the Low Countries."

Peace of Longjumeau (1568).—Some time afterwards Condé received 9000 German landsknechts who demanded their pay on the first day; all the Huguenot army, chiefs and soldiers alike, being taxed to supply it. Condé advanced to Chartres in order to interrupt communications between Paris and Beauce,

The queen-mother, jealous of her power, had no wish to appoint a successor to the constable, and had no soldiers to oppose to the Huguenots. L'Hôpital regained his influence and spoke of peace, which was made at Longjumeau, on condition that the Protestants should restore the places which they had seized, but that the Edict of Amboise should be fully restored (March 23, 1568).

Disgrace of l'Hôpital (1568).—The peace was lame and uneasy. Catherine de Medici had signed it only in order to make another war. It was indeed impossible for arms to be laid down in France at that time. The Catholics, under the strong influence of Rome, recovered the energy of an earlier age; already in part of Champagne a *holy league* had been signed. The war of religion raged everywhere; in Great Britain between Elizabeth and Mary Stuart; in the Low Countries between Alva and the *gueux*[1]; even in Spain itself, between Philip and his son, Don Carlos. The latter, being suspected of heresy, or at least of tolerance, was thrown into prison and died there, perhaps being slain by his father's order. Catherine also wished to end this war, which constantly revived by some Italian *coup*.

L'Hôpital was not the man to forward such a policy, and he was disgraced. It was alleged that there was a plan to seize Condé and Coligny in Burgundy on the same day; also Jeanne d'Albret, widow of Anthony of Bourbon, in Béarn, in order that they might suffer the fate of Counts Egmont and Horn, who were executed at Brussels with nineteen other Walloon lords by the bloodthirsty Duke of Alva. All three escaped. Condé and Coligny, after a journey of a hundred leagues, reached La Rochelle, which had declared for them in the last war. Jeanne d'Albret joined them there with her son, Henry of Navarre. "She was a woman only by her sex; her whole mind was devoted to manly pursuits; she had statesmanlike ability and a heart which was invincible in adversity. She offered her life, her means, and her children for the defence of the cause; to repair the ruin which had been effected she gave up her land and pawned her jewels, her great collar of emeralds, her large rubies, and two pieces of the cabinet of the King of Navarre."

Third Civil War (1568–1570).—Catherine in her turn had failed to effect a *coup*, but she believed herself to be ready for war. She declared it by publishing an edict which forbade, under penalty of death, the exercise of the "pretended reformed religion," and which ordered Protestant ministers to leave the kingdom within fifteen days. All members of the parliaments

[1] Poor or wretched people.

and the universities were forced to take an oath of adherence to Catholicism. Great military strength was necessary to enforce such edicts, and the court only had an army of 18,000 infantry and 4000 cavalry. It was placed under the command of the young Duke of Anjou, whom Catherine wished to bring to the front in order that she might be able, if necessary, to oppose him to Charles IX. Tavannes and Biron directed him.

All the south-west was now in the power of the Calvinists, La Rochelle was their stronghold. "We have driven them from Orleans," says a contemporary, "because from so near they might scent our good city of Paris, but the town of La Rochelle has not yet been captured. It is not so large or so pleasant a place as Orleans, but it has compensating advantages, among which is its situation on the sea. All provisions come in abundance to its port, the people are rather warlike than commercial, the magistrates are prudent, and all are devoted to the reformed faith."

Battle of Jarnac: Death of Condé (1569).—A preliminary campaign in the midst of a hard winter was without result. In the following spring, Marshal Tavannes attempted to cut off the Protestant army in the south from the reinforcements which it was expecting from Germany and to defeat it before their arrival. The two armies manœuvred for some time on the Charente; at last Tavannes surprised Coligny, with the rear-guard only, near Jarnac (March 13, 1569). Condé, at the news of the attack, hastened up with three hundred horse. Already wounded in the arm, he received, at the moment of the charge, a kick from a horse which lamed him. But he charged the enemy, crying, "Remember in what state Louis of Bourbon entered battle for Christ and country." This impetuous charge broke the enemy's lines, but Condé's horse was shot; he fell and a terrible combat took place around him. An old man, La Vergne, who had brought twenty-five men-at-arms, his sons, grandsons, and nephews to the battle, was seen to make the last effort to protect Condé; but La Vergne was slain and fifteen of his men fell with him "in a heap." Condé gave his gauntlet to a gentleman when the captain of the Duke of Anjou's guards recognised him and blew out his brains.

The loss of this brave and energetic prince, who had been for nine years the brain and arm of his party, was serious. The Protestants thought of abandoning the campaign and shutting themselves up in La Rochelle, but a woman revived their spirit. Jeanne d'Albret appeared in the midst of the disheartened army

at Saintes with her son, Henry of Navarre, and the young Prince of Condé. "My friends," she said, "here are the two new leaders whom God has given to you, and two orphans whom I entrust to your care." Henry of Navarre, who had been born at Pau and brought up severely like a country gentleman, was then fifteen. Brave, witty, able to find words to express his thoughts, he pleased every one; he was named *generalissimo*, with Coligny as his adviser and lieutenant.

Coligny: Battle of Moncontour (1569).—Coligny had many of the qualities necessary to a leader in such a war. A convinced and austere Protestant, he was loved and respected alike by ministers and soldiers. He was not perhaps a great general, and Catherine, with all the Italians of the court, despised him; nor was he a profound politician. But he never permitted himself to be beaten, which gave him great force; he had just views, knew how to make use of every resource, and if with him as leader Protestantism could not hope for a decisive victory, it was at least secure from irreparable defeat. Two things besides his name recommended him: his defence of St. Quentin and his last political scheme, the conquest of the Low Countries, where he wished to settle his Huguenots in order by one stroke to give France fair provinces and peace. In his great desire to avoid internal discord and to secure religious liberty, he had conceived another way of accomplishing the same design, the Protestant colonisation of America, wishing in the sixteenth century to do that which the English Puritans did in the seventeenth. Had he succeeded, French language and French blood would to-day dominate North America. Jarnac was only a rearguard action and the Protestants lost only 4000 men. Coligny was still strong enough to defend Cognac and Angoulême; being joined by 13,000 Germans, he resumed the offensive and inflicted a check upon the Catholic army near Roche-Abeille. But Tavannes retrieved the situation. German Catholics and Spaniards sent by Alva, and Italians sent by Pius V., increased the forces of the Duke of Anjou, who recrossed the Loire, relieved Poitiers, which the admiral had besieged for six weeks, and attempted to surprise the Protestant army between the Dive and the Thoué, near Moncontour. The Huguenot position was extremely bad and they lost 6000 soldiers.

But this victory was as useless as that of Jarnac. Charles IX., jealous of the laurels which his brother was winning, came to the army, and instead of pursuing the Protestants to the Pyrenees, wasted time in besieging Niort and St. Jean d'Angély.

Coligny crossed the south and suddenly appeared in Burgundy at the head of all the Protestant nobility of Dauphiné and Provence. A Catholic army of 12,000 men attempted to check him at Arnay-le-Duc ; he cut his way through and reached Loing a short distance from Paris.

Peace of St. Germain (1570).—Catherine de Medici excelled in diplomacy. This now appeared clearly. No conclusion could be reached by fighting with a foe who though constantly defeated as constantly recovered from defeat ; it was necessary to adopt a different plan. To disarm the Protestants, she granted them the Peace of St. Germain under very favourable conditions: the free exercise of their religion in rural districts and in those towns in which their faith was established ; the admission of Calvinists to all offices; and four cautionary towns, La Rochelle, Cognac, Montauban, and La Charité, which the reformers were allowed to garrison.

St. Bartholomew (1572).—At the news of this peace a cry of indignation went up from the Catholics at home and abroad. Catherine was not disturbed and continued to follow her new policy. The marriage of Henry of Navarre with Marguerite, sister of Charles IX., was to cement the peace, and she hastened it. It was to the interest of France to employ in foreign war the martial and disorderly spirit of the Protestant nobility, and she accepted the suggestion of Coligny that he should lead his co-religionists into the Low Countries where the Duke of Alva had executed 18,000 persons and where the *gueux* of Holland were founding the Dutch Republic. Such a scheme delighted the Huguenots, and appeared to be a return to the older ideas of foreign policy which had been abandoned since the death of Henry II. Coligny saw in a war with Spain a means by which the internal peace of France might be maintained with glory and security.

Charles IX. was then twenty-one years old. Though he was intelligent, he was feeble and violent, eager to possess absolute power, surrounded by Italian favourites who corrupted his mind ; he played the part which his mother had assigned to him with readiness, and sometimes of his own accord. More than once he had found the Huguenot leaders proud and haughty and he remembered the murderous advice which Alva is said to have given him at Bayonne: "A thousand frogs' heads are not equal to the head of one salmon." But he was now impatient under his mother's control and jealous of the victories which she ascribed to his brother. Impulsive and passionate he entered

with ardour into the new projects, writing to Coligny and to Jeanne d'Albret, and urging the speedy conclusion of the marriage of Henry with his sister. The Queen of Navarre and the admiral decided to visit Paris. "At last we have you, my father," said the young king as he embraced the latter, "and we shall not let you escape us when you wish." Following the example of their leader, a number of Huguenot gentlemen came to take their part in the fêtes and to share in the favour of the king.

Catherine herself was alarmed; she had succeeded too well. The king saw only with the eyes of Coligny; he pressed for the arrival of the dispensation for the marriage, which the pope was anxious to refuse; he caused troops to be raised for Coligny and assembled a fleet against Flanders. The Protestants, encouraged, drew up at La Rochelle a confession of faith, which still obtains in their communion in France. Catherine remonstrated with her son, who received her rebukes with impatience; he had decided to win glory and renown by a Spanish war, and he told his mother that she and the Duke of Anjou were his greatest enemies. But passion fought for Catherine. The Duke of Anjou, the Guises, Tavannes, and all the Catholic nobles who had fought against the reformed faith, saw with anger that power had passed to their enemies. Philip II., threatened in the Low Countries, lavished money among the people in order to excite disturbance. When the court came to Paris, with its new following of Huguenot gentlemen and ministers, dull anger seized the city. Emotion was aroused by the sudden death of Jeanne d'Albret, who was supposed to have been poisoned, though there was no proof (June 9). When the marriage was celebrated (August 18) there was great difficulty in preventing a riot at the gate of Notre-Dame; the churches re-echoed with curses against the Huguenots, who on their side were guilty of provocations in the streets.

Catherine then adopted a Machiavellian plan. She designed that Coligny should be assassinated by the Guises. The Huguenots would then take vengeance on the murderers of their leader, and the royal troops would be able to fall on both as violators of the public peace. On August 22, Coligny was wounded, as he left the Louvre, by a pistol shot fired by Maureval, a professional assassin in the pay of the Guises. At the first news of this crime, Charles IX. hastened to the admiral: "Yours is the wound, mine the pain," he said, and he swore to avenge him.

On the following day, the king appeared to be of the same mind. But the queen began to work on him, assisted by the Duke of Anjou, the Duke of Angoulême, Tavannes, the Chancellor Birague, Marshal de Retz, and the Duke of Nevers, of whom the three last were Italians. The queen represented that the two parties were both ready to take up arms, that each had chosen a chief, that the king would possess merely the royal title, even if that were still left to him. "War is inevitable," said Tavannes, "and it is better to win it at Paris than to risk all on the issue of a campaign." The king resisted; his mother quoted the Italian proverb that "Cruelty is often mercy, and mercy cruelty"; she threatened to quit the court with her other son, the Duke of Anjou, that she might not witness the ruin of her family, that she might no longer be offended by such timidity and cowardice. She had calculated well the effect of this last remark on a violent mind. Charles, hitherto unmoved and quiet, cried suddenly that as it seemed good to kill the Admiral, he would have all the Huguenots in France slain, that "no one may be left to reproach me." One of the Italian councillors had already said that it was advisable to kill them all, since the sin of a few murders was as great as the sin of many.

The municipality of Paris was ready. For some time it had considered this possibility, and all was prepared to ensure its success. The provost of the merchants was summoned to the Louvre; he received from the king an order to close the gates and to hold in readiness such captains, lieutenants, and bourgeoisie as were trustworthy. The clock of St. Germain l'Auxerre was to give the signal at three o'clock on the night of August 24, the festival of St. Bartholomew. The conspirators did not wait till then; at ten o'clock the bell rang, and a little later the tocsin made answer from all the churches.

Henry of Guise, d'Aumale, and the Bastard of Angoulême rushed to the hotel of Coligny. A German, Behme, was the first to enter. Coligny was awake. "Are you the Admiral?" cried Behme. "I am," he answered, his expression calm and untroubled. "Young man, you should respect my white hairs, but do as you will, for you will not greatly shorten my life." Behme stabbed him in the breast. The Duke of Guise cried from below, "Behme, have you done it?" "It is done," was the answer. "Throw him from the window then." Coligny still breathed. Behme and the others threw him into the courtyard, where Guise, having spurned the corpse with his foot, abandoned

it to the insults of the people. The houses of the Huguenots had been marked with chalk and a list prepared of those who inhabited them. Téligny, the Admiral's son-in-law, La Rochefoucauld, a friend of the king with whom he had spent the evening happily, Pardaillan, La Force, whose second son feigned death and remained all day hidden under the corpses of his father and elder brother—these were murdered after the Admiral, the majority being surprised in bed. "Kill," cried Tavannes, as he ran through the streets, "killing is as good in August as it is in May."

The King of Navarre and the Prince of Condé took refuge with the king, who threatened them with death if they did not recant. Some were slain even in the Louvre, and the ladies of the court went in the morning to see the dead bodies. Different estimates are given of the number of the slain; some say ten, others four, others two, thousand. The last estimate is the most probable.

If l'Estoile may be believed, the king sat during the morning at a window of the Louvre, jeering at those who passed, and firing with an arquebus at the Protestants who fled down the Faubourg St. Germain. But during the day, when he had seen the dead borne down the Seine, his lust for slaughter passed. He was filled with horror at what had been done and wrote to the provinces to prevent the spread of the massacre, throwing all the blame of the feud on the Guises and the Châtillons. But Catherine made him fear that the profit of the crime would pass to his most dangerous enemies. A hawthorn was found in second bloom; this was regarded as a miracle and reanimated fanaticism. The mob, with the instincts of a brute beast which are ever present in the depth of its mind and in the heart of every great city, once more began to kill. Not only Huguenots, but also creditors, rivals, personal enemies were slain. Robbers, with a cross in their caps and a white handkerchief on their arms, killed as alleged Huguenots those whom they wished to pillage. The slaughter continued in the following days, and murders did not cease until September 17.

The king, following his mother's advice, assumed in a full session of the parliament the responsibility for this terrible night, and sent new orders to the governors of the provinces, which resulted in massacres at Meaux, La Charité, Orleans, Saumur, Lyons, Bourges, Toulouse, Bordeaux, and other places. From 15,000 to 20,000 victims perished. At Angers the massacre was checked by the moderation of the municipal council,

but the survivors were imprisoned, and their goods, with those of the dead, were confiscated by express order of the Duke of Anjou. "Monseigneur," said the agent, "may well make more than a hundred thousand francs in this way." St. Bartholomew enabled some to balance their accounts and to fill their purses.

Some governors refused to obey the court, among others Montmorency in the Ile de France, Longueville in Picardy, Charni in Burgundy, De Gordes in Dauphiné, Joyeuse in Languedoc, and St. Hérem in Auvergne. The rudest lesson was given to the murderers by the public executioner at Troyes; he refused to aid in the slaying, saying that his office did not compel him to execute any one except as a result of judicial condemnation. The hangman of Lyons made the same answer.

Vezins, lieutenant of the king in Quercy, had a mortal foe, Regnier, chief of the Protestants of that province. They had long been opposed to each other, seeking only for an opportunity to cut one another's throats. At this time they were both in Paris. When the massacre began, Regnier saw Vezins enter his chamber with a drawn sword followed by fifteen soldiers. He thought that his last hour had come, but Vezins ordered him to go down, mount his horse, and follow him. They left Paris, and took the road to their own province; Vezins did not utter a word. Regnier travelled a hundred leagues, protected against all attack by the name of his escort and arrived home safe and sound. Then Vezins spoke to him. "Do you think that the service I have done you has been done in order to win your friendship? It has been rendered that I may take your life honourably." Regnier answered, "It is yours and you may use it as you will." "Are you then such a coward," cried Vezins, "that you will abandon the treason which you have supported?" "No," said Regnier, "I am at the service of all brave men, friends and enemies alike." Such incidents relieve the picture of the cowardly treachery of the court.

L'Hôpital must be included among the victims of this terrible outburst of fanaticism. A band of assassins, employed by the Duke of Anjou, came to Vignay, near Étampes, where the chancellor lived in retirement with his family. He was urged to hide, but refused, saying, "If the postern is not large enough for them to enter by, open the great gate." The assassins were about to enter the château when some knights met them and checked them. Their leader told the old man that his death was not ordered, that he was pardoned. "I do not know that I have merited either death or pardon," said l'Hôpital. Grief and shame

killed him in six months: he died, crying, "Perish for ever the memory of that dreadful day."

Fourth Civil War: Peace of La Rochelle (1573).—This great crime was useless, as crimes always are. The Protestants had lost their chiefs; when the first moment of stupor had passed, they took up arms in many towns with the rage of despair. The royal army experienced the effects of this at the sieges of Sancerre and La Rochelle. The peasants, who had taken refuge in the first of these towns, had no weapons. They made slings and used them with such vigour and effect that they revived for a while the reputation of these ancient arms, which were called the *arquebuses of Sancerre*. The Duke of Anjou commanded before La Rochelle and was unable to take it, though accompanied by his brother, the majority of the nobles, and almost the whole court. The King of Navarre and the Prince of Condé had been forced to accompany him and to aid those who wished to murder their brothers and to exterminate their other friends. But religious enthusiasm was excited by fifty-seven ministers who were shut up in La Rochelle, while Nîmes, Montauban, and a hundred other towns, in which the Protestants were in the ascendancy, closed their gates. At the same time, the queen saw that among the Catholics there were some who, if not favourable to the Calvinists, were at least hostile to the Guises, to their ambition and furious intolerance. Montmorency and his brothers were not with the royal army; they began to form a third party, which soon afterwards appeared. Ready enough to assassinate, they were not inclined for war. The resources of the crown were exhausted sooner than the courage of the Rochellois. After four assaults no advance had been made; the Duke of Anjou, anxious to go and receive the Polish crown, began negotiations. Charles IX. was obliged to grant to the Protestants the Peace of La Rochelle, by which they received liberty of conscience, at the very moment when he received, for the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the eager and enthusiastic congratulations of the courts of Rome and Spain.

Death of Charles IX. (1574).—The shame of this reverse, remorse, the effects of a violent disposition and of vigorous exertions in hunting, to which he was passionately devoted, wore out the young king. A dreadful disease attacked him; he suffered from fits and from an access of delirious fury, during which blood poured from his skin, his nose, and his ears. Bloody visions terrified him, and he heard in the air lamentable cries. On the night before his death, the doctors excluded every one

from his chamber, except "La Tour, St. Prox, and his nurse, whom he loved deeply even though she was a Huguenot. Lying on a chest, she began to doze; then hearing the king groan, weep, and sigh, she went gently up to him. He took her hand, and sighing and weeping so violently that clots of blood choked his utterance, he began to say, 'Ah, my nurse, my mother, what blood and murders. I have followed evil counsel. My God, pardon me; I know well that I am damned.' The nurse said, 'Sire, the murders and blood are those which you have been made to commit; as you did not consent to them, believe that God will not hold you guilty for them and will shield you under the mantle of His Son. But, for the love of God, cease to weep.' Then she took a handkerchief with which she wiped away his tears and he signed to her that she should go and rest."

Such is the story of this royal homicide, dying at the age of twenty-four, tormented by gloomy visions, abandoned by all save his Huguenot nurse. It is a story which illustrates the powerlessness of crime to sear the conscience of the guilty.

CHAPTER XLV

HENRY III. (1574–1589)

Henry III.—The Duke of Anjou, heir-presumptive of Charles IX., was in Poland at the time of his brother's death. As the result of lengthy negotiations, Catherine de Medici had secured from the Polish nobility a crown for her favourite son, for him whom she called the victor of Jarnac and Moncontour. Henry was soon filled with disgust at this *Sarmatian land*, where the rude and masculine nobility was ignorant of the luxury and depravity which the corrupted civilisation of Italy had spread in France. At the news of his brother's death, he fled from his capital by night, like a criminal. Pursued by his subjects, who wished to keep him, he did not halt until he reached Austrian territory. The pleasures of Vienna and of Venice delayed for some time his return to France, and he did not set foot in his new kingdom until two months after his stealthy flight from the old.

No prince could have been less fitted to deal with the situation which existed at the death of Charles IX. The victories which Tavannes had gained in his name had exaggerated his reputation. Abuse of pleasure had cooled his original heat, which had

at first rendered him as brave as his ancestors ; he had no taste left for anything except passing his time with some boy or woman, in whose company he gave himself up to monstrous debaucheries. The depravity of his court served to vitiate his intellectual gifts ; he was eloquent only in lying, able only in deception. It may be an exaggeration to say that his piety was merely a species of impiety, but his religion did not amount to more than the performance of certain outward ceremonies. He believed that by means of fasting and some strokes of the discipline he might satisfy Heaven and his conscience alike. His brother, Charles IX., had on occasion formed ideas and projects worthy of a king ; Henry was engaged only in puerile activities, and d'Aubigné, seeing a man so careful over his toilet, concerned about his complexion, and eager to preserve the whiteness of his face and hands, did not know whether he was looking at " a female-king or a male-queen." Charles IX. committed crimes occasionally and from passion ; Henry constantly and from principle ; he read only the works of Machiavelli, and he was without that redeeming quality of remorse which makes it possible to pardon many of his brother's misdeeds.

His first acts showed what might be expected of him. At Turin he repaid with prodigal magnificence the hospitality of the Duke of Savoy by ceding to him Pignerol, Perugia, and Savigliano, the last remnants of the conquests of Francis I. beyond the Alps. As soon as he had entered France, he ordered the Protestants to revert to Catholicism or leave the kingdom. His words were threatening enough, but the Protestants were relieved to see that his actions were limited to the sending of some officials into the southern provinces, which were then very disturbed, and to joining in religious processions, in which he mingled with the flagellants who walked through the streets scourging themselves for the remission of their sins. He made a solemn entry into Paris which scandalised the serious, as he was surrounded by a number of apes, parrots, and small dogs. At Reims, according to l'Estoile, " When he was crowned, he said aloud that the crown hurt him, and it twice slipped from position as if it wished to fall to the ground." This was regarded as a bad omen and the foreboding was justified. Henry's head, which could not bear a crown, was unable to conceive those strong and virile plans which were needed for the crown's defence.

The Politiques.—France needed an able, honest, and strong leader, to take charge of the reins of government. Castelnau

estimated that " there have already died on account of the civil wars over a million persons, all under pretext of religion and the public good, the excuse which both parties put forward." Catherine de Medici had with great difficulty prevented a fresh outbreak in the last days of Charles IX. and during the two months of her regency. Between the extreme Catholics and the fanatical Protestants, a third party had formed, the *Politiques*, composed of moderate Catholics who desired the restoration of public peace by religious toleration and the repression of all factions. The three Montmorency brothers, Damville, Thoré, and Méru, were the most eminent members of this party, which included a great number of magistrates and rich bourgeoisie. A prince of the blood, the Duke of Alençon, assumed its leadership, less from patriotism than from ambition, since he fancied that it would serve his private ends. The Guises led the extreme Catholics, the Bourbons the Protestants ; the duke thought that, avoiding alike isolation and the second place in either of the contending factions, he could form a third party which would be devoted to his cause. Henry of Navarre called him, with justice, " A double heart, a soul as malign and deformed as his body." But it must be admitted that two things redound to his credit: he wished to be a Frenchman, the foe of the Spaniards in word and deed, as he himself said, and he did lend himself to the slaughter of the Huguenots.

Alliance between the Politiques and the Huguenots : Fifth Civil War (1575–1576).—The massacre of St. Bartholomew and the civil war had caused the disappearance of the great Protestant leaders. The Calvinists had only such men as the King of Navarre to guide them, who put their personal interest first, their religion second. This practice easily extended among men with whom ambition or patriotism extinguished religious enthusiasm. Already during the illness of Charles IX., the Duke of Alençon, the King of Navarre, the new Prince of Condé, and the Montmorencies had formed a project for securing control of the government. At the critical moment, the Duke of Alençon's heart failed him and he revealed everything. Condé alone was able to escape ; Catherine secured the persons of the King of Navarre and of the two Montmorencies, Thoré and Méru, of whom for a time she thought of making an example. But their party still existed ; at a later date it absorbed the other two, while for the present it formed a third faction in the state. Condé and Damville, the Protestants and the *Politiques*, concluded through their envoys at Milhaud in Rouergue a treaty

of alliance, in order to secure the release of the princes, liberty of conscience, and the assembling of the States-General.

Battle of Dormans : the Balafré (1575).—The new king soon discovered the designs of his brother and as he had learned only one lesson from his mother and from Machiavelli, he attempted to assassinate him. Alençon was often in danger of death, but he succeeded in escaping and hastened to conclude in the south the alliance between the Protestants and the *Politiques*. Damville in Languedoc assembled some 15,000 soldiers and Condé sent from Germany, where he had taken refuge, an advance guard of 5000 men. The Lorraines had regained favour ; the king married a princess of their house and they prepared energetically for war. But Catherine distrusted them and negotiated on all sides. The Duke of Guise left her to her own devices and set out against the Germans whom he defeated at Dormans near Château-Thierry in Champagne (1575). The danger which he ran in this battle, in which he was wounded in the face, increased his popularity ; he was henceforward the hero of the Catholics, the *Balafré*[1], a worthy heir to the great Guise. But Condé made his way without opposition at the head of 18,000 men and sixteen cannon across Champagne and Burgundy ; he crossed the Loire and joined Alençon at Moulins. The escape of the King of Navarre increased the hopes of his party. One evening as he was chanting under his breath the words of the psalm which treats of a man abandoned by his friends, d'Aubigné, the poet-historian, suggested flight to him. "Let us go," answered Henry ; "they killed my mother, the Admiral, and all my best servants at Paris; I will never return there unless they drag me."

Peace of Monsieur (May, 1576).—To support this war, Henry attempted to "pick the pockets of the people of Paris" ; he drew from them remonstrances and murmurs. After the success of Guise at Dormans, he was still further pressed to treat. Alençon came forward as mediator and arranged at Beaulieu the peace which bears his name, "the Peace of Monsieur," the latter being the title borne by the king's eldest brother. His mediation was not disinterested. He caused Anjou to be handed over to him, and himself assumed the title of duke of that province ; he also received Touraine and Berry with all regalian rights, being bound only to homage. The King of Navarre secured the government of Guienne ; Condé that of Picardy. The free exercise of religion was accorded to the Protestants in the whole kingdom, except at Paris and in the court, until the

[1] From *balafré*, a cut on the face.

approaching meeting of the States-General and of a free general council of the Church; all sentences given since the reign of Henry II. on religious grounds were annulled, and the marriage of priests was recognised as lawful. By rehabilitating the memory of Coligny and of the victims of the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the widows and children of whom received exemption from taxation; by the cession of several cautionary towns, and by the establishment of mixed tribunals of Catholics and Protestants, the monarchy sought pardon for the past and gave guarantees for the future.

The Holy League.—This peace was regarded as a betrayal of the Catholic cause. The feeling of passionate unrest, which had for a moment been calmed by the great sacrifice of St. Bartholomew, revived with extreme energy. Men asked how the king stood after reigning for two years. He had levied certainly millions enough from his good towns, raised loans enough from the clergy, created enough offices, onerous or injurious to the country. But all had been swallowed up by his fêtes and by the greed of his favourites, the *mignons*. The property of the clergy had been handed over for a loan of 200,000 livres, in order to pay German mercenaries who ravaged the provinces. The court had abandoned the Catholics, but the Catholics would not abandon themselves.

A Seigneur d'Humières, Governor of Peronne, refused to hand over that town to Condé, who was named governor of the province, and caused prelates, lords, and bourgeoisie to sign "a most Christian union, that they would employ their goods and their lives in order to preserve the town and province in obedience to the king and in maintenance of the Catholic faith." Already under Charles IX. attempts had been made in various districts to form similar leagues, in Burgundy, Anjou, and elsewhere. The example of the Seigneur d'Humières was now contagious. The clergy, and especially the Jesuits, whose numbers and activity increased with the danger, urged on the mob; soon each province had its league. It remained to unite and to direct the efforts of this religious zeal towards a common end, and this task was undertaken by political ambition.

Henry of Guise, a less able and less magnanimous warrior than his father, had more ambitious designs, more extensive plans, and a much greater capacity for making religion serve his political purposes. He was able to unite under his own control all the threads of this great Catholic conspiracy, designed for the defence of the faith. He drew up and circulated throughout the

whole of France the constitution of the *Holy League*. Princes, lords, gentlemen, and all other members swore that "they would maintain religious worship according to the formularies of the Holy Catholic Church; that they would maintain King Henry III. in his royal estate, splendour, and power, and preserve to him that authority over his subjects which was due to him; that they would restore to the provinces those rights, franchises, and liberties which they had possessed in the time of Clovis; that they would proceed against those who opposed their union without regard of persons; that they would obey promptly and faithfully to the death the chief who should be chosen."

Pretensions of Guise.—The chief of the League was chosen beforehand, but Henry of Guise carried his ideas to a far greater length, and the League was for him merely a stepping-stone to the throne. Henry III. was already ruined in the opinion of the people; the most daring pamphlets denounced his hypocrisy and his conduct. The new Duke of Anjou was abused as an accomplice of the Huguenots and was doomed to an early death. After these two men, the only heirs were the Bourbons, heretic princes, unworthy to fill the throne of the Most Christian King. If they were excluded, the path lay open to the faithful allies of Philip II. and of the holy see, to the murderer of Coligny, to the man who had signed an alliance with orthodoxy in blood on the day of St. Bartholomew. More impatient spirits did not even reach this conclusion by such devious paths. New genealogies traced the house of Guise back to the dynasty of Charlemagne; the descendants of Hugh Capet reigned only by virtue of usurpation, and Henry of Guise was called upon to restore at once legitimate monarchy and the orthodox faith, by confining the last Valois in a cloister, "as his ancestor, Pippin, had confined Childeric." Such was the scheme found in the memoirs of an advocate who had died at Lyons on his return from Rome.

First States-General of Blois (1576).—The States-General, which met at Blois in December, 1576, revealed to Henry III. the extent of the danger. The League, by the use of every method of fraud and violence, had excluded the *Politiques* and the Calvinists from the electoral meetings, and among the deputies there was only one Protestant. Elected under the influence of Guise, the States attacked not only the liberty of the Protestants but also the authority of the king. At the same time as they demanded the restoration of religious unity, they demanded also that those resolutions which they reached unanimously should have the

force of law, and that thirty-six members, chosen by themselves, should have the right of sitting in the royal council.

But all was not yet lost. The masses of the people were not included in the League; the bourgeoisie even regarded it with a certain apprehension. The *quarteniers* and *dizainiers*[1] of Paris, who went from house to house collecting signatures, were generally ill-received. It was thought this new idea was merely a method for emptying purses.

Henry III. declares Himself Chief of the League.—Henry rejected the political demands of the States, but he placed himself at the mercy of the extreme Catholic party. He signed the league and declared himself its chief, thinking that he had made a master-stroke; he supplanted the Guises and secured the subscriptions demanded from each member of the League. He thus descended from the position of a king to that of a party chief, and at the same time declared war against the Calvinists. The latter took his action for what it was, seized Périgueux, La Réole, and Marmande and protested in writing against the illegal States of Blois.

Violent Declarations against the Reformers.—The States, at the request of the king, decided upon the suppression of the reformed religion. It was easy enough to vote this, but the vote meant war, and money was needed to make war. Bodin, author of the *Treatise on the Republic*, vainly tried to secure the triumph of principles of toleration. "The power to do all does not convey the right to do all," he said openly to Henry III. and the League. He met with more success when, under pretence of defending the interests of the third estate, he refused the king means for carrying on the war. The partisans of Guise took the opportunity of showing the impotence of monarchy and the king had neither subsidies nor the right to make over portions of the crown lands in order to meet expenses, "since the capital is the property of the provinces and the king has only a life-interest." "This is too cruel," said Henry, "for they will neither help me with their property nor allow me to help myself from mine." He had thought to suppress the Guises; they had produced a deadlock.

Sixth Civil War: Treaty of Bergerac (1577).—The peace promised to the Huguenots had not been kept; war against them was badly conducted. Henry III. would not employ the Duke of Guise from fear of increasing his power. The Duke of Mayenne, appointed to the command in Poitou in preference to his elder

[1] Guardians of wards or quarters of Paris.

brother, only succeeded in taking Brouage; the Duke of Anjou, placed at the head of the army of the Loire, rested on his laurels after taking La Charité and Issoire. Henry profited from these slight successes to conclude the Peace of Bergerac with the Huguenots. He negotiated it personally and called it his own peace, in opposition to the previous treaty, the Peace of Monsieur. By it the Protestants were granted a more extensive liberty of conscience than in the previous treaties and it was better defined; they were given special judges in the eight parliaments and eight places of security; while the abolition of all confederations was decreed. The king hoped thus to attack the League itself, under a show of providing securities against the Huguenots.

The Order of the Holy Spirit (1578): Ordinance of Blois (1579).—Henry really desired peace. To win over some of his opponents he instituted the *Order of the Holy Spirit* in memory of the fact that he had ascended the thrones of Poland and of France on the day of Pentecost. He hoped by granting this decoration to the chief partisans of the Guises and Bourbons to attach them to himself. He placed too much reliance on men's love for baubles. It is a curious fact that in the midst of these disastrous times important legislative reforms were accomplished. In the midst of the clash of arms and the violence of factions, the magistrates continued their great work of improving the civil law. The Ordinance of Blois, consisting of three hundred and sixty-three articles, contains excellent and liberal legal maxims, but it also indicates the strength which Catholicism had recovered after some years of peril. The king preserved the right of nomination to bishoprics and benefices, with the proviso that he should observe certain conditions as to age, character, and learning in the persons nominated. Plurality in archbishoprics, bishoprics, and cures was forbidden. Residence was made obligatory; simony was prohibited. Marriage, which a priest alone might celebrate, was protected by the most severe provisions; a father might disinherit a son who had contracted a clandestine marriage. Useful provision was made against the usurpation of the title of nobility, the sale of offices, the creation of too many offices, and dishonesty in the administration of justice.

The Court of Henry III.—But the conduct of the king destroyed the effect of the wisest measures. Merciless pamphlets reveal the character of the licentious and ferocious court of the last Valois, where murders alternated with pleasures. The evenings were filled with fêtes and balls; the mornings with duels and murderous encounters, when, indeed, the duel was not anticipated by a

treacherous assassination. Thus St. Mégrin was murdered by the men of the Duke of Guise; Dugast by those of the King of Navarre; Bussy d'Amboise by the Count de Monsoreau. A favourite of the king, Villequier, killed his wife; a wife killed her husband; Cimier killed his brother. Each prince had assassins in his pay who slew secretly, as well as favourites who killed openly. Three *mignons* of the king fought one day with three favourites of the Duke of Guise. Four of the combatants were left dead, among them two friends of the king. Henry gave every sign of a scandalous grief, and replaced his dead favourites by Joyeuse and Épernon, who were no better. At the wedding of the former the enormous sum of 1,200,000 crowns was expended.

To meet these wild expenses, the *taille* was every year increased; new financial edicts were constantly reaching the parliament, which only registered them after a lengthy resistance. Discontent was general. One day the clergy ceased to provide the interest on the loans at the Hôtel de Ville, which it had promised to pay; as a result a number of persons were ruined. On another occasion the States of Normandy, Brittany, Burgundy, and Auvergne summoned the king to restore taxation to the state in which it had been in the time of Louis XII. and threatened "to oppose by all proper and possible means the extraordinary levies of money and pernicious edicts."

Seventh War: Peace of Fleix (1580).—A short war, which arose without cause and ended without reason, indicated the progress made by the sentiment of disorder. Henry, who had more taste for petty intrigues than for great affairs, intervened in the quarrels between the King of Navarre and his wife Queen Marguerite, in order to embitter their relations. Although unscrupulous, Henry of Navarre did not tolerate such interference in his private concerns, and taking up arms in anger he began a short war which was known as the *Lovers' War* from its origin. He distinguished himself by the capture of Cahors, which he stormed after a fight of four days and four nights. But Marshal Biron beat the people of Navarre several times, and peace was restored by the Treaty of Fleix, a repetition of that of Bergerac.

Expedition of the Duke of Anjou into the Low Countries (1581–1583).—It was necessary to occupy these turbulent minds with some great idea, to engage them in some serious enterprise, to resume, in short, the project of Coligny, and to enter upon a foreign war, in order that civil war might cease. France had a

choice between two fields of battle, one of which lay at her very door and was entirely favourable to her. Philip II. of Spain had invaded Portugal, and Catherine de Medici had pretensions to that crown. The Low Countries were occupied by the Spaniards and several provinces demanded a liberator. Henry III. gave a fleet to Don Antonio del Crato, the claimant to the throne of Portugal, and an army to his brother, the Duke of Anjou, whom the Flemings had called in; both were insufficient, and the king openly disavowed both enterprises. The fleet was annihilated; the Duke of Anjou, after being proclaimed Duke of Brabant and Count of Flanders, being left without money and having alienated his supporters in the Low Countries, was forced to evacuate that country. He died less than a month after his return to France (June, 1584). The provinces of the Low Countries, which lost at the same time William of Orange, who was assassinated by a fanatical Catholic, made a tempting offer to Henry III.; they would give themselves to France if he would free them from the Inquisition and from Philip II. But it was too late.

Revival of the League after the Death of the Duke of Anjou.—The death of the Duke of Anjou, brother and heir-presumptive to the king, raised definitely a question which was bound to rekindle in France every religious and political passion. Hitherto it had been vaguely anticipated that a Bourbon, a relapsed heretic, might become the heir of the Valois. Now he actually was the heir. Henry III., the last surviving son of Henry II., had no heir, and was only expected to live for a few years. The League had been for some time disorganised; "Its members," says l'Estoile, "were all disgusted with it, some condemning it, others laughing at it." Suddenly, without its leaders making any move, it revived and extended its hold upon the popular mind; in place of a secret society it became a great revolutionary party. The authors of this change were not, as l'Estoile declares, "pots and pans of the Sorbonne, good councillors of state, who all their lives had been shut up in a college, playing the pedant and devouring poor students of theology," but Jean Boucher, curé of St. Benedict; Prevost, curé of St. Severin; Launoi, an ex-Protestant minister who had become a canon; La Chapelle-Marteau, master of finance; Crucé and Bussy-Leclerc, solicitors; and almost all the preachers of the churches of Paris. The League spread from the capital to the provinces and established wherever it was powerful a reign of terror.

Treaty of Joinville between the Duke of Guise and Spain (1584).—Henry of Guise saw clearly that the moment for striking

his great blow had come, and he signed the Treaty of Joinville with Philip II. without hesitation. By it the contracting parties engaged to extirpate sects and heresies, to exclude heretical princes or those who granted public immunity to heretics from the throne of France, and to assure the succession of the Valois to Charles, Cardinal of Bourbon. This Charles was merely put forward to conceal the pretensions of the Guises until they could openly avow them. But having taken this precaution, the Guises received a free hand from Pope Gregory XIII. "It was not good," so the pope was alleged to have declared, "to attempt the king's life; but it would be well to seize his person and to surround him by those who would hold him in check." The manifesto of the League appeared in the following year (March, 1585). The signatories swore that they would not lay down arms "until the Church of God had been restored fully to the Catholic faith, the nobles reinstated in their franchises, and the people relieved from the new taxes." Action soon followed. Guise raised Champagne; Mayenne, Burgundy; Elbeuf, Normandy; Mercœur, Brittany; Aumale, Picardy. The cities of Lyons, Bourges, Orleans, Rouen, Angers, Reims, Châlons, Soissons, Peronne, Amiens, Abbeville, Caen, Dijon, and others declared for the League. The whole kingdom was in a blaze.

Treaty of Nemours between the King and the Duke of Guise (1585).—The position of Henry III. became very difficult. Importuned by Elizabeth, by the deputies of the United Provinces, by Henry of Navarre, who offered him his aid, he was inclined to declare against the Guises whom he detested, but he demanded that Henry of Navarre should become a Catholic, promising in that event to recognise him as his heir. Henry refused. "He was the most crafty and cunning prince in the world," says d'Aubigné. He was resolved only to alienate the Protestants on good conditions, for specific gains and not for mere promises. He answered the manifesto of the League by assuming against the conspirators the rôle of champion of the king and the laws of the state. It was a clever move; he recovered the alliance of the *Politiques*. Montmorency, "the King of Languedoc," joined him, and he took up arms in Guienne and Poitou.

Henry found himself between the two enemies whom he had long hoped to use against each other, between the Guises and the Bourbons, between the Catholics and the Protestants. All the great towns were not in the League and the royal name preserved a certain prestige. The king was still obeyed; taxes were still

paid to him, and from them he was able to raise soldiers. The League, well suited for a riot, was not prepared to wage a war, since it included few of the nobles and few of the bourgeoisie. Épernon defeated some of the League's troops at Gien, Joyeuse beat others in Touraine. But Paris was disaffected; Guise entered it with 12,000 men, and a reverse there would have meant complete destruction. Henry III. approached the Lorraines, hoping that he might once more deceive them. By the Treaty of Nemours he signified his approval of all that had been done in the cause of religion; handed over to the head of the League nine cautionary towns; on his return to Paris, he published an edict which prohibited the reformed faith under penalty of forfeiture, giving fifteen days to ministers and to Protestants to leave the kingdom. As he came out of his palace the king was loudly applauded by the people. He was not accustomed to such treatment; but the applause was not for him; it was for the war against the Huguenots. The pope urged the war with all his power. Sixtus V. declared that the two Bourbons, Henry and Condé, had lost their rights as princes of the blood and were unworthy of the succession to the throne. Parliament vainly protested against the violence thus done to consciences, "which are exempt from the power of fire and sword," and against a papal bull which it described as an attempt against the liberty of the crown. There was no longer any place for moderation.

Henry of Navarre.—But the prince who was to be the leader of the moderate party was able to face all these dangers. There are two Henrys of Navarre. The first is that of tradition, the second that of history. The former is the more heroic figure and, thanks to Voltaire, the more popular. The other, beneath his cunning geniality, is the more able and, owing to the suppleness of his character, much the better fitted to restore a crumbling social edifice than a man whose character was more sincere would have been. Henry of Navarre was brilliantly brave; this quality is one which is common to the warriors of that and of all other ages, but which is pleasing in a prince, while a chief who is ever ready to bear his life at the point of his sword is secure of the devotion of his soldiers. Brought up among the mountaineers of the Pyrenees, he had their agility and his body was insensible to fatigue. The vicissitudes through which he had passed had rendered his religion uncertain. When Charles IX. said to him "Death or the mass!" he chose the mass; later he had abjured it, and this abjuration was not his last. He had no hatred for

those who professed a different creed; his temperament made fanaticism odious to him, and his position urged him to tolerance. To toleration he remained attached. He was a brave soldier and a joyous companion; little affected by good or evil fortune; bending and not breaking under disaster; finding resources in the most desperate situations; loving pleasure but not as Henry III. loved it; humane by his good nature and from his experience of life; having friends who, it is true, received from him rather good words than good things. But he had an open heart when his hand was closed, and that because for twenty years he was the leader of a party obliged to give much and take little, unless from an enemy. His forced residence at the court of the Valois was fatal to his morals. For some years he forgot the part which he had to play and his destiny. After the death of the Duke of Anjou, Duplessis-Mornay wrote to him, "The past is no longer in season. It is time that you should make love to France." Henry knew this well; he abandoned pleasure and assumed the cuirass.

Every one attacked him; he had an answer for everything and every one. A protest, posted up in the Vatican, declared his excommunication by Sixtus V., the *soi-disant* pope, null and void, and entered an appeal to the court of peers. Duplessis-Mornay, who was called the Pope of the Huguenots, drew up a declaration by which the King of Navarre and his allies "undertook the support of the king's cause against the leaders of the League, the authors of all the evils of France." Condé in Poitou, Damville in Languedoc, Lesdiguières in Provence, Henry himself in Guienne, held all the south. The Queen of England and the German princes, after insistent appeals, promised prompt aid. Elizabeth had written to Henry III. after the Treaty of Joinville "in brave language and in a pleasant style that she might make him ashamed of having treated with rebels: 'For the love of God, wake from your long sleep.'"

Anarchy in the Kingdom.—The king was only half asleep. He was still anxious to pursue his balancing policy between the two parties. But the horizon was dark with clouds; the Prince of Orange had been already murdered by a man whose heirs Philip II. had rewarded; Elizabeth answered this murder by another, that of Mary Stuart. At Paris, the chiefs of the sixteen quarters formed a council in the heart of the League, in order to increase its activity, and the terrible memories of St. Bartholomew were revived. A preacher declared openly from the pulpit that "a blood-letting of St. Bartholomew is needed to

put an end to the illness," and the men of the halls said that "it was necessary to begin the game of destroying the king."

In the provinces anarchy reigned supreme. Under pretence of restoring unity of religion the leaguers as well as the Huguenots sacrificed the unity of the state. Each governor was encamped in his province, and counting on the early dissolution of the monarchy lived as master; feudalism had risen from the tomb in which monarchy had interred it. The cities, on their side, demanded their old liberties, "the franchises which the provinces had possessed in the time of Clovis." Historically this expression is absurd; as a political idea it has great significance. At Paris, at Marseilles, at Toulouse, at La Rochelle, in a hundred other places, the municipal magistrates resumed that military authority which they had lost in the fifteenth century, and that civil jurisdiction which l'Hôpital had attempted to take from them. They no longer recognised any bounds to their financial action. The communes attempted to regain their power because feudalism was reviving. The Bible was then in all hands—not the Gospel which rendered unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and the spirit of which is that of charity and peace—but the Old Testament in which the prophets utter so many stern rebukes, so many threats and cries of revolt against tyrants. To the League the tyrant was the king, secretly favourable to the Bourbons; to the Huguenots, he was also the king, the instrument of the Guises. Francis I. had believed monarchy to be everything; it would apparently soon be nothing.

Eighth Civil War, or War of the Three Henrys (1586–1589): Battle of Coutras (1587).—No hostilities of importance occurred in 1586, but in the next year the help arrived which had been promised by the allies of the two parties and greater blows were struck. Henry III. conceived a plan which was not without ability of a Machiavellian order. He put himself at the head of a good army which was to hold the line of the Loire, sent Joyeuse with a strong force against the King of Navarre in Guienne, and gave the Duke of Guise too weak a force to enable him to withstand the Germans. His hope was that the King of Navarre would be defeated by Joyeuse, and Guise by the Germans, after which he himself, in the centre, would be able to crush by the superiority of his forces what remained of these three armies, the Leaguers, the Calvinists, and the Germans. But all went ill for him.

Henry of Navarre was unable to cut his way through the two

armies of the king and Joyeuse in order to join his German allies north of the Loire, but he drew Joyeuse southwards into a wholly Huguenot country. The two armies met at Coutras at the junction of the Isle and the Dronne. When the Huguenots saw the enemy their ministers chanted the verse of the Psalm, *So he bringeth them unto their desired haven* and at the same time fell on their knees. "They tremble," cried the foolish youths who accompanied Joyeuse, "the cowards are confessing." "You are wrong," answered an old captain, "when the Huguenots behave in that way they are resolved to conquer or to die." "Cousins," cried the King of Navarre to Condé and Soissons, "I say nothing to you but that you are of Bourbon blood, and by the living God, I will show you that I am your senior." "And we will show you that our house has a good younger branch." Navarre had mingled musketeers with his cavalry; he awaited the charge of Joyeuse at a distance of fifteen paces, opened fire at that close range, and then charged in his turn. In an hour every man in the royalist army was dead, wounded, or in flight. At the end of the battle, the King of Navarre fought hand to hand with a cornet, Château-Renard. "Surrender, Philistine," he cried to him, and made him prisoner. Joyeuse gave up his sword to two Huguenots, but a third blew out his brains with a pistol. The victory had only a moral effect. Henry wasted his time by bearing to the feet of the Countess de Gramont the standards which he had taken from the enemy. This was the last serious blunder into which passion betrayed him.

While Henry of Navarre thus hastened back to the heart of Gascony instead of destroying the remains of the army of Joyeuse on the Loire, Guise to the north of that river triumphed over the Germans. Having scarcely 12,000 men, he took care not to attack the army of the Baron of Dohna. He harassed its flanks, cut off its stragglers, its convoys, and its forage parties. Dohna, after much hesitation, advanced to the Loire near La Charité. There he found Henry III. who barred his passage and drove him back upon the Duke of Guise. The Swiss were already disgusted with a campaign in which they gained no booty, when Guise surprised them at Vimory, near Montargis, and killed 2000 of them. Dohna wandered for some time between the two armies in a most critical position. Henry III. made the mistake of leaving to his rival the credit of freeing the country from this pest; he also endeavoured to corrupt the Swiss with bribes; Guise again inflicted heavy losses upon them near Anneau and accomplished their dispersal.

Day of Barricades (1588).—Henry III. returned to Paris, defeated both by the League and by the Huguenots. He went, however, to Notre-Dame to render thanks to God in triumph for his victory over the enemies of the faith and kingdom. But he deceived no one. "Saul has slain his thousand, but David his ten thousand," cried the mob as he passed. Some days later, the Sorbonne decided that "It is permissible to take the government from princes who are unfitted to rule, as guardians are given to the incompetent." Henry III. could not misunderstand this. He forbade the Duke of Guise to come to Paris, and caused 4000 Swiss to encamp in the faubourgs St. Denis and St. Martin, with several companies of guards. The Sixteen thought that they were lost; they appealed to Guise, who, disregarding a second prohibition, arrived on May 9.

No sooner was he recognised than cries of *Hosanna to the Son of David* resounded through Paris and accompanied him to the Louvre. An old woman made her way through the crowd and having gazed at him cried that she could die content, as she had seen the deliverer. The king received him, pale with anger. "I sent you word that you were not to come," he said. And despite the excuses of the duke, he would perhaps have caused him to be murdered at this first interview if his mother and his advisers had not dissuaded him, fearing that it would lead to a general revolt in Paris. The king fortified himself in the Louvre, the duke in the Hôtel de Guise. For some days they negotiated with each other. On May 11, in the morning, the duke again visited the Louvre with a strong escort, spoke boldly, ordered the king to dismiss his advisers, establish the Inquisition, and pursue the war against the heretic with vigour.

In the evening the king ordered the companies of the city guard, in whom he thought he could trust, to occupy several points. On the following morning, he brought in by the gate St. Honoré the Swiss and 2000 men of the French guard, whom he stationed on the Pont St. Michel and on the Marché-Neuf. But the city guards were disloyal. When they saw the Swiss in the city, they believed that Henry III. proposed a St. Bartholomew of the Catholics. The people rose near the Bastille and in the Place Maubert, and began to throw up barricades with cries of "Vive l'Union! Vive la Ligue!" In two hours all Paris was in arms, all the streets were rendered impassable, and the barricades were soon extended to the places occupied by the troops.

The Count de Brissac put himself at the head of the people.

The Swiss, attacked on all sides by a rain of bullets and projectiles, were thrown into disorder and, being unaccustomed to war of this kind, demanded mercy. Guise came out of his hotel, dressed in white, a wand in his hand, and saved the Swiss who were about to be massacred, sending them back to the king with an insulting disdain. The whole tumult was appeased as by magic. Guise still only desired power, not the title of power, and he was content to become mayor of the palace to a new figure-head of a king. It was too much or too little. Henry III. sent his mother to Guise, who demanded the lieutenant-generalship of the kingdom for himself, the convocation of the States at Paris, the destruction of the Bourbons, and the governorship of provinces and all offices for his friends. Catherine de Medici debated for three hours on these terms. During the discussion the attack was suspended; Henry III. was able to leave the Louvre and fly. He swore that he would never re-enter his capital save through a breach in the walls.

Second States-General of Blois (1588).—The Duke of Guise had blundered, but if he had not secured the king he had at least secured Paris. On the same evening, he required the first president, Achille de Harlay, to undertake not to interrupt the course of justice. The austere magistrate reproached him severely for his designs, and ended by saying, "It is a pity when a valet drives out his master; as for me, my soul is in the hands of God, my heart is with the king, and my body is at the mercy of the wicked." "I have been," said Guise after this interview, "in the most critical battles, sieges, and fights, but I have never been so astonished as I have been by this man."

There was now a King of Paris and a King of France. Negotiations continued, and men were amazed to see Henry III. grant the very things which he had refused two months before at the time of the barricades. He consented to disgrace Épernon; swore not to lay down arms till the heretics were destroyed; declared all non-Catholic princes deprived of their rights to the throne; appointed Guise lieutenant-general; and assembled the States at Blois. It seemed that all he had gained by his flight from Paris was that the States should not meet there. But he had his reasons for acting as he did.

The States of Blois were only composed of leaguers. The most violent enemies of the king were nominated as presidents of the three orders, the Cardinal of Lorraine, Brissac, the hero of the barricades, and La Chapelle-Marteau, Guise's provost of Paris. The king in an able and eloquent speech, such as he knew

how to make, complained of the unbounded ambition of some of his subjects. This was daring, and the clergy required that the phrase should be cut out of the printed version of the speech. Some time was then spent in discussing whether the States should proceed by resolution or by prayers addressed to the king, who was declared to be only the president of the States, while all power rested with them. When this question had been settled, it was demanded that the *taille* should be reduced and that the courtiers should disgorge their plunder. "The people," said Brissac to the king himself, "has greatly cooled in the love which it bore to its princes; if this assembly proves to be illusory, you will lose what faith and love the people still bear to you." Outside, the most ardent leaguers spoke of making Guise constable, and of shutting up the king in a monastery if he resisted. The Duchess of Montpensier displayed, hanging by her side, the golden scissors which were to "make the monastic crown of Henry III."

Assassination of the Duke of Guise (1588).—The invincible Armada had been destroyed; the ally of Philip might be struck down. Some tried to put the Duke of Guise on his guard. "He would not dare," he answered. The king did dare. "I have long been under the tutelage of Messieurs de Guise," said Henry to his intimates; "I am resolved to be rid of them; he who has a companion has a master." Some proposed legal imprisonment and a formal trial. "To put a Guise in prison," answered the king, "is to bind a wild boar with string; he will prove too strong for our cords." The plan was settled beforehand and the day fixed for the eve of Christmas.

On December 22, the duke was again urged to leave Blois. "He who leaves his party destroys it," said the Archbishop of Lyons, and Guise added, "My affairs are in such a state that if I saw Death entering by the window I would not go out of the door to avoid him." The king had announced that he would spend Christmas at Notre-Dame de Cléry and that a privy council would be held at six in the morning. At four o'clock he called his personal guard, the Forty-Five. "You are all obliged to recognise," he said to them, "how great an honour I have done you by entrusting my person to your valour and fidelity. You are indebted to me, I wish to be indebted to you. The Duke of Guise intends to make a last effort against my person, that he may then dispose of my crown and life. I am reduced to such an extremity that either he or I must die, and that this morning. Will you serve me and avenge me?" They all cried that they were ready to kill the rebel. "*Cap de Dieu!*"

cried one of them, "we will deliver him to you dead." The king himself distributed the daggers to them and posted them in his chamber, in his cabinet, and on the staircase. At the same time, with that entirely Italian devotion which so easily mingled crime with prayer, he caused a mass to be said by one of his chaplains that God might give him power to carry out his design.

The duke arrived later than was expected. On his way he received a message which warned him of his fate. "It is the ninth," he remarked. When he reached the council chamber, he sat down for some time. "I am cold, and my heart fails me," he said. Some minutes later, a secretary of state summoned him to the king. He passed from the council chamber into that of the king, saluting the gentlemen and going towards the door of the cabinet in which he supposed Henry to be. As he lifted the curtain, one of the assassins seized him by the arm and plunged his dagger into his breast, crying, "Die, traitor." All drew their daggers. "Ah, my friends, my friends," cried the duke, and though struck on all sides, he dragged his murderers from one end of the chamber to the other, as far as the king's bed, where he fell dead. "Ah," cried the cardinal, when he heard the noise, "they are killing my brother." "The king has business with you, monseigneur," answered Marshal d'Aumont, "do not stir." He was arrested and despatched next day by the halbardiers. When the murder had been committed, the king came out of his room to see his dead enemy, and looked at him for a long time. Then he hastened to the queen-mother, who lay dying at the age of seventy. "I have become King of France," he said, "since I have slain the King of Paris." "It is not enough to cut out," replied Catherine de Medici, "it is necessary to sew as well. Take care that you have not made yourself king of nothing."

Assassination of Henry III. (1589).—To kill the Duke of Guise was not to kill the League. Henry III. had given way to his longing for revenge by this crime; he had not attained any political end. "The serpent is dead, and the poison is dead also," he said. He was deceived; Guise drew his strength from the League, not the League from Guise. At the news of his death, which reached Paris on Christmas Day, consternation at first reigned supreme, then fury blazed forth. All the churches resounded with curses against the treacherous tyrant, Henry of Valois, and with lamentations over the two brothers, "martyrs for Jesus Christ and the public." The famous preacher Lincestre declared that Herod was no longer King of France and caused

his hearers to swear that they would shed the last drop of their blood in order to avenge Guise's death. "Raise your hand on high," he cried to the President Harlay, "raise your hand on high that the people may see it." Night and day processions paraded the capital. In one of these a hundred thousand persons carried tapers, which they put out, crying, "God, extinguish thus the race of Valois."

The Sixteen compelled the city council to give the command of Paris to the Duke of Aumale until the arrival of Mayenne. The Sorbonne decreed that "the French people was released from its oath of fealty to Henry III." As it was difficult to overcome the monarchical temper of the parliament, that body was thinned out. The governor of the Bastille, Bussy-Leclerc, appeared at the palace; Achille de Harlay was there. He had been warned in the morning to remain at home, but answered, "I will do nothing of the sort; they could not seize me in any better place than in my official chair." When Bussy-Leclerc read the list of those whom he had come to arrest, the first of whom was the president, fifty of the members rose and followed him.

Henry had made no effort to profit from the murder. His mother, as she died, had urged on him the need for promptitude and resolution. He believed that it was still possible to negotiate, and wrote to the pope, to Philip II., to Mayenne, to Henry of Navarre, and even to the League, which last sent back his herald in disdain, without even hearing him. Épernon and some thousand lords had hastened to the king, but he had no real force; those who were not members of the League belonged to the party of the *Politiques* or of the Protestants. Papal excommunication launched against him for the murder of a cardinal increased his embarrassment. He no longer had any resources to use against the leaguers, and resigned himself to an appeal to the King of Navarre, an alliance with whom would involve also an alliance with the *Politiques*.

Before the last tragedy, the King of Navarre had been in a most critical position. The triumph of Guise and the League would have been his ruin. "The devil is let loose," he wrote, "and it is marvellous that I do not fall under such a weight. If I were not a Huguenot I would become a Turk. Soon I must be either a fool or a wise man. This year will be my touchstone." It was. From this time he became a man skilled in steering across the shoals his own fortune and that of France. Henry III. received him at Plessis-les-Tours, after having handed over to

him as security the strong fortress and town of Saumur, which commanded the passage of the Loire. The King of Navarre arrived in the garb of a soldier, and fell at the feet of Henry III., who raised him and addressed him as his brother.

The junction of the Protestant and royal armies under the same standard entirely changed the character of the war. Monarchical power was no longer threatened by Huguenot feudalism, but by the democratic League; the crown began a struggle with the Catholic masses arrayed against it. Henry III. summoned the remnants of the parliament to Tours and issued a manifesto against Mayenne and the leaders of the League. Henry of Navarre conducted the war with vigour. Pithiviers, Étampes, and Poissy were taken by storm. Pontoise made an energetic resistance; the King of Navarre was nearly killed, a musket shot, aimed at him, killing a Huguenot colonel on whose shoulder he was leaning. In two months he was master of the territory between the Loire and the Seine, and had been joined by 15,000 Swiss landsknechts; the two kings appeared before Paris with an army of 40,000 men (July 30, 1589). They captured the bridge of St. Cloud and the Parisians could see the long line of their enemy's camp fires stretching in a vast semicircle on the left bank of the Seine from Argenteuil to Vaugirard. The King of Navarre established his headquarters at Meudon, Henry III. at St. Cloud. Gazing at the towers of the city from which he had been so ignominiously expelled, he cried, "Paris, you head too great for its body, you need a blood-letting to cure you and to free the state from your madness." He hoped to bring about a St. Bartholomew against the League. Even in Paris his friends did not hide themselves. They said openly that within three days there would be so many hanged that there would not be enough wood for the gibbets. Henry sent word to the Duchess of Montpensier that he would burn her alive on the day of his entry. She answered that she would deserve a worse fate if she could not hold the barricades against him.

But the great city was terrified. The people had lost their energy, though fury reigned among the leaders and in the depths of the monasteries. The Duchess of Montpensier spared no pains to excite the frenzy of the preachers. A fanatical hand became the instrument of the general fury and put into practice that doctrine of tyrannicide which had been so often supported in schools and pulpits.

It had been decided to deliver the assault on August 2. On the morning of August 1 a young brother of the convent of the

Dominicans, Jacques Clément, came out of Paris and made his way to St. Cloud. According to the royalist accounts he came to carry out a plan arranged by Mayenne and the Duchess of Montpensier, having prepared for his deed by fasting and by receiving the Sacrament. He was provided with a forged letter from the President Harlay to Henry III. and was well instructed in his part. Being conducted to the king, he announced that he had to inform him of some important matters in secret. The guards withdrew and as soon as the king approached him, the assassin drew a knife from his sleeve and stabbed the king in the abdomen. "The wicked monk has killed me," cried Henry. He himself drew the weapon from the wound, from which his entrails protruded, and struck the assassin on the face. The guards, hastening up at the noise, despatched the murderer where he stood.

It was thought the wound would not be mortal, but a violent fever soon seized the king and announced his approaching death. Henry of Navarre came to him. "My brother," said the king, "you see how your foes and mine have treated me; know surely that you will never be king unless you become a Catholic." Then turning to those who surrounded him, he said, "I beg you as my friends and I order you as your king to recognise my brother here after my death; for my satisfaction and as your bounden duty, I adjure you to take the oath to him now in my presence." All took the oath. Henry III. died during the night, at the age of thirty-eight and after a reign of fifteen years. The race of the Valois was extinct.

Six months earlier the aged Catherine de Medici had died, with despair in her heart, under the curse of the Cardinal of Bourbon, who accused her of having enticed the Guises to their death. She had not even the satisfaction of feeling that her life had been beneficial to her family. After thirty years of effort, of scheming, and of crimes, intended to secure the power of her sons, she saw her race threatened in the person of its last representative, the kingdom torn asunder, the crown dragged in the mire, and either the League or the Huguenots about to triumph.

But Catherine de Medici found an unexpected apologist. One day in 1600 the President de Groulard recalled to King Henry IV. the evils which she had brought upon France. "But I ask you," answered the king, "what could a poor woman do who was left after her husband's death with five young children in her arms; with two families striving to seize power, our own and that of the Guises? Was she not compelled to employ foreigners

to deceive both parties and so to guard her sons, who successively reigned through the wise conduct of a clever woman? I am amazed that she did not commit worse crimes." It was when all his troubles were over that Henry spoke in this way; when experience of the affairs of this world had taught him to be rather prudent than vindictive. But he was able to forget too easily his murdered friends; and for a brave soldier who had never stained his hands except in blood honourably shed, he pushed respect for capacity to an extreme point. It is true that he also used deceit with advantage to himself.

CHAPTER XLVI

THE REIGN OF HENRY IV. FROM 1589–1598

Henry IV.: His Initial Difficulties.—The assassination of the last of the Valois caused grief and consternation in the camp of St. Cloud, joy and confidence in Paris. In the camp the Catholics at once parted from the Protestants. An eye-witness relates that the former were seen "behaving like madmen, tearing off their caps and throwing them on the ground, sheathing their daggers, plotting, joining hands, making vows and promises, which ended with the phrase: 'May we rather die a thousand deaths.'" In the city, the Duchess of Montpensier and the Duchess of Nemours drove through the streets in their coaches, crying at every corner, "Good news, friends! Good news! The tyrant is dead; there is no longer a Henry of Valois in France." Bonfires were lit and in the pulpits panegyrics were pronounced on "the blessed martyr Jacques Clément," who was invoked as a saint. His aged mother was brought to Paris and exhibited to the people as a marvel.

"You are the king of brave men and only cowards will abandon you," one of the Catholic lords had declared to Henry IV. But despite this loyal speech, many of the Catholics retired, and to keep the rest on his side, Henry solemnly engaged, in a meeting of the chief nobles, to maintain in his kingdom the Catholic faith, until the assembling of a national or general council which should regulate the religious question; to preserve for every man his rights and offices, while guaranteeing to the Calvinists liberty of worship in one town in each bailiwick. The meeting then acknowledged him as king, under the name of Henry IV., "in accordance with the fundamental law of the

realm." (August 4.) The act of recognition was drawn up, signed by all present, and registered by the parliament at Tours.

In Paris, though there was agreement on the point of religion, there was no longer agreement on the personal question. It was the opposite of what had happened at St. Cloud. Resolved to exclude a heretic from the throne, the members of the League hesitated between the young Duke of Guise and his uncle, the Duke of Mayenne. The first had been, since his father's death, a prisoner in the hands of the royalists and as a result had been somewhat forgotten ; the other, an able politician, lacked all the qualities of a popular leader: daring, reputation, constant activity, and promptness in decision. There were other candidates: the Duke of Lorraine, brother-in-law of the last three Valois kings ; the Duke of Savoy, son of a sister of Henry II. ; and the King of Spain, who spoke of the rights of his daughter, the child of a sister of Henry III., and who counted confidently on seizing the kingdom in the midst of the anarchy which he was ready to provoke. Mayenne, all-powerful in Paris on the morrow of Henry III.'s death, might have made trial of his fate ; he did not dare to do so, and on August 5 caused the Cardinal of Bourbon, who was then a prisoner in the hands of Henry IV., to be proclaimed king under the title of Charles X. Mayenne contented himself with assuming the lieutenant-generalship of the kingdom. This decision decided nothing. By recognising the right of the Bourbon family, Mayenne indicated that Henry was the lawful king.

But the declaration of August 4 did not satisfy every one in the royalist army. Épernon and many Catholic lords withdrew ; La Trémoille, with nine Protestant battalions, set out at midday, "Not being willing to serve under the banner of a sovereign who was ready to protect idolatry." The army of the besiegers was reduced by one-half. It was impossible to remain before a great city with only some thousands of men and many advised the king to retire to the south. "Who would believe you to be King of France if he saw your letters dated from Limoges ?" said d'Aubigné to him. Henry decided to remain in the north, and by this decision saved his crown.

Divisions of France.—France, and not only France but almost every province, was divided. By the side of a town which held to the League was a town which held to the king ; there was a parliament of Paris and a parliament of Tours. The king's parliament was divided, part sitting at Caen, as the parliament of Carcassonne was later formed at the expense of that of Toulouse.

A sixth of France was on the side of Henry IV.; the remainder was almost unanimous for the League. Many cities and provinces, such as Bordeaux and a part of Guienne, remained neutral; some governors and powerful magnates, such as Épernon, Damville in Languedoc, and Ornano in Dauphiné, awaited the course of events.

Campaign of Henry IV. in Normandy (1589).—The real king was to be found only from his acts. Henry sent Longueville into Picardy, d'Aumont into Champagne, to gather for him what troops and money they could, while he himself went into Normandy. Senlis, Compiègne, Gournay, and Gisors received royal garrisons, and handed over their revenues, of which the army had great need. An attempt on Rouen failed, but Henry, turning suddenly upon Dieppe, captured it. It was a valuable acquisition, since it gave him communication with England, from which he expected help. The Governor of Caen did homage to him for half Normandy.

At Paris murmurs were heard against the slowness of Mayenne. He left the city with 25,000 men, collected 8000 more, and advanced towards Dieppe, promising to make "the King of Béarn" (Henry IV.) prisoner or drive him into the sea. Henry had less than 10,000 men and very little money. "My shirts are all torn," he wrote to Rosny, "my doublet is out at elbows, and for two days I have supped and dined with both." The members of the council advised him to sail to England. Marshal Biron opposed this idea. "Leave France," he cried, "for twenty-four hours, and you will be banished for ever." Henry IV. agreed with Biron. He took Eu and Tréport and established himself strongly in Dieppe, having his camp on the heights of Arques below the castle, but a league and a half from it, and a strong garrison in Pollet the chief suburb of the town. His artillery was insufficient; he supplied the want by mounting his smallest cannon on rollers which were drawn by several horses, and thus introduced light artillery, an idea which was borrowed by Gustavus Adolphus and Frederic II.

Battles of Arques (September and October, 1589).—The great army of Mayenne was repulsed in continuous attacks for three weeks by the able dispositions and still more by the valour of Henry and his troops. No part of the town or of the entrenchments was left unassailed, but the attack was everywhere repulsed. On September 21, in an attack on the camp, Mayenne's landsknechts feigned surrender; they were brought within the lines. Then they fell on those who were welcoming them and

captured part of the entrenchments, some of their leaders making their way even as far as the king and calling on him to yield. The disorder was such that Henry cried, "Are there not fifty gentlemen to die with their king?" Châtillon with the Huguenot infantry came from Pollet and succeeded in overwhelming the traitors. Mayenne then moved his position, turning that of the king, and appeared before Dieppe from the west. But Henry had foreseen his plan and provided against it. He had received 1200 men from England, with money, provisions, and the promise of a further 4000 soldiers. Longueville, La Noue, and d'Aumont came to his help with another army. Mayenne retired on the Somme and called to his help the Spanish army of the Low Countries. Henry wrote gaily to Crillon, "Hang yourself, brave Crillon; we have been fighting at Arques and you were not there."

Attempted Surprise of Paris (1589).—Henry in his turn found himself at the head of 25,000 men. He gained three marches on Mayenne and moved rapidly on Paris, ordering Montmorency-Thoré to cut the bridge of St. Maxence over the Oise behind him. Favoured by a thick fog, all the faubourgs on the left bank were captured, St. Germain, St. Jacques, St. Marceau, and St. Victor, the royalists raising the cry of "St. Bartholomew." If the monks and the citizens had not been prepared the surprise would have succeeded. La Noué had already passed the Seine near the tower of Nesle, but news came that Mayenne was advancing by the bridge which had not been cut, and Henry, after sacking the faubourgs, in order to compensate his soldiers for their lack of pay, retreated to Tours, the royalist capital.

Successes of Henry in the West (1589).—On his march, Henry took Étampes, Chateaudun, and Vendôme, and from Tours persuaded Le Mans, Alençon, Angers, and Laval to recognise him. In some weeks all Normandy from the Seine to the Vire was in his power. The news of this success influenced those who had remained neutral. Two cardinals came to receive him at Tours; the parliament of Rennes made submission with part of Brittany; Ornano and Lesdiguières in Dauphiné, La Valette in Provence, and Damville in Languedoc declared for him. Abroad, the republic of Venice recognised him as lawful king, and Sixtus V. himself was influenced by the motives which had induced the Catholics to follow him.

Rivalries in the Party of the League.—The rival ambitions of Henry's enemies aided his cause. The Dukes of Lorraine and Savoy, abandoning the idea of securing the kingdom, sought to

dismember it, the former aspiring to the Three Bishoprics and the latter to Dauphiné and Provence. The Dukes of Mercœur, Nevers, and Nemours wished to establish independent principalities. Philip II. who had the council of the Union and the Sixteen in his pay demanded from them the title of protector of the kingdom in the name of his daughter, and the Sixteen on their side desired a kingdom without a king or nobility, a kind of theocratic republic governed from the pulpits. Mayenne himself had secret hopes, but he could only have made them known if he had gained a victory. He therefore renewed the campaign, reforming the council of the Union, which he filled with his partisans before leaving Paris.

Battle of Ivry (1590). — The king was besieging Dreux. Mayenne, to save the town, gave battle in the plain of St. André near Ivry (March 14). The leaguers had 16,000 men, including 4000 cavalry, so that their front displayed a thick forest of lances. The royalists had 8000 infantry and 3000 cavalry, armed only with swords and pistols. Henry was urged to secure his retreat in event of a defeat. "There can be no retreat save the field of battle," he answered; adding, "Friends, keep your ranks well; if you lose your companies, cornets, or guides, the white band on my arm shall serve to guide you while I have a drop of blood. Follow it; you will find it always in the path of honour and glory."

The battle was joined simultaneously in every direction. The king charged the French and Walloon lancers; with his men, he passed under their long and heavy lances, attacked them with vigour hand to hand, and put them to flight. The royalist light horse gave ground before a Walloon squadron; Henry hastened to them, "Turn," he cried, "if you will not fight, watch me die." At the end of two hours, the whole army of the League was in flight. Having gained the victory Henry remembered that he was King of France. "Quarter for Frenchmen, death to the foreigners," he cried. Five pieces of cannon, eighty companies of infantry, twenty bodies of cavalry were included in the booty of the victors. The road to Paris was open, and Henry took it.

Siege of Paris (1590).—Paris was ill supplied with food and munitions of war, and its walls were in bad repair. The Parisians supplied all these deficiences by their religious exaltation. A monk called Chrestin was employed to inform the people of the defeat of Ivry; he took as his text the words, "I chastise those whom I love." As he began his sermon, a courier handed him a letter; he went on to recount all the details of this lesson which the

Lord had given to His people, and sent all his audience to the walls. The preaching of Rose, Boucher, and Lincestre each day maintained this enthusiasm, and the presence of Gaietano, a papal legate, was a further assistance. He swore that he would not leave Paris, whatever happened, and caused the Sorbonne to decree that any one who spoke of treating with the Bourbon was guilty of mortal sin and that Henry's enemies would receive the martyr's crown.

Thirty thousand men enrolled themselves; bells were melted into cannon; a brother of Mayenne, the young Duke of Nemours, who had become a citizen of Paris in order to flatter the democratic element, directed the defence. On the day following the first assault, a strange procession traversed the streets of Paris. The chief heroes of the League, Rose, Boucher, and Lincestre, with shaven beards and heads, wearing gorgets over their hoods and *rochets*,[1] swords at their side and halberds in hand, began the march; they were followed, in fours, to the number of 1300, by Cordeliers (Franciscans), Jacobins (Dominicans), Carmelites, Capuchins, and Feuillants (monks of the Order of St. Bernard) in order of battle, battle-axe or musket on shoulders. They wore a garb half religious and half military and their appearance gave an impression half comic and half tragic. The "Church militant," chanting hymns to the sound of salvos of musketry, defiled before the legate, who blessed them and hailed them as veritable Maccabees, a title which some of them indeed gained during the defence of the walls.

Henry hardly expected to take a city thus defended by storm, but he relied with confidence upon famine and cut off all supplies, hoping in this way to break down the resistance of the citizens. He only raised them, according to d'Aubigné, "to a high degree of determination to win a just and glorious vengeance." They sustained famine as well as war. The death of the old Cardinal Bourbon simplified the situation and rendered the hatred of the leaguers more furious.

On July 24, the king delivered an assault and at the end of two hours the faubourgs were captured. Distress was then at its height. After having each day reduced the rations distributed to the people, the city authorities could now give nothing more; each had to provide for himself. The horses, asses, and mules which still survived were slaughtered; every living thing, even vermin, was killed and eaten. The Duchess of Montpensier refused to give up a little dog which she kept, she said, "as a

[1] Part of a bishop's robes.

last resource to preserve her own life." Some stole the bones of the dead to make from them a kind of paste and ate this horrible food. The men-at-arms began to hunt for small children and a mother ate her own baby.

Legend often appears in the midst of history. There is a story that Henry IV. allowed food to enter Paris while he was besieging it; history records that his servants d'O, de Givry, and others did relax the severity ordinary in such cases and caused some help to be sent to their friends within the city. If Henry's generosity was not such as to lead him to destroy with one hand the work which he was doing with the other, it at least led him to lament such a spectacle of misery. "I would rather not have Paris," he said, "than cause the death of so many persons." One day, meeting some peasants who were condemned to be hanged for having sent in bread by a postern gate, he caused them to be released, gave them some money, and said, "The Béarnais[1] is poor; if he had more, he would give you more."

Intervention of the Duke of Parma (1590).—Fearing to lose the Low Countries, then greatly disturbed by Maurice of Nassau, Philip ordered his best general, the Duke of Parma, to go to the help of the Parisians when they were reduced to the last extremity. Advancing from Valenciennes (August 3) the duke reached Meaux none too soon, for the siege had lasted four months (August 23). Already the *Politiques*, though few in number, had begun to assert themselves and to shout in the streets, "Bread or peace." "Had there been two days more delay," says one writer, "the Parisians would have been forced to open their gates to Henry IV. and even to beg him to enter." The king advanced against the Spaniards, intending to engage them on the plain of Chelles. Parma, an able tactician, skirmished with the French, kept them occupied for four days, and on the fifth, aided by a thick fog, surprised Lagny which commanded the route to Paris by the Marne, as Corbeil commanded that by the Seine. From Lagny he sent a numerous flotilla of boats, filled with soldiers and provisions, to revictual Paris, and all the efforts of Henry during this campaign were lost.

Intervention of the English and Germans: Capture of Chartres (1591).—During the winter the Viscount of Turenne, one of the most able of Henry's supporters, was sent to England and Germany. He obtained 7000 English from Elizabeth, 2000 Dutch

[1] Henry IV. was often called the Béarnais, because his native country, Navarre, was formerly known as Béarn.

from Maurice, and levied in Germany 4000 cavalry and 8000 infantry whom he paid himself. In recognition of these signal services, he received from the king the hand of the heiress of the petty sovereignty of Bouillon and Sedan, on the frontiers of Champagne. Turenne had not yet joined the king, when Henry took Chartres, the granary of Paris. As nine-tenths of the French bishops had recognised him, he held there a council of the national Church by which the excommunication issued against him by Gregory XIV. was declared null and void. He could not hope to take Paris, which had a garrison of 4000 Spaniards, but in order to invest the capital from a distance and to cut off its supplies from Normandy, as by taking Chartres he had cut off its supplies from Beauce, he suddenly appeared before Rouen (November, 1591).

Siege of Rouen (1591–1592): Battles of Aumale and Yvetot (1592).—The siege of Rouen was a second siege of Paris. The League was very strong there and the defence was directed by Villars-Brancas, Governor of Normandy, a man of energy and resource. If the famine was not so severe as it had been in Paris, the assaults were more sanguinary. Parma appeared once more to relieve the place in March, 1592. Henry did not now wish to repeat the error which had been made during the siege of Paris. He left Biron with the infantry to continue the siege, and at the head of a light and courageous cavalry force of 7000 men, advanced to meet the enemy. At Aumale he ventured with 600 men into the midst of the Spanish army, was wounded by a musket shot, and only escaped because Parma was unable to believe that the King of France had come into the fighting line to fire a pistol "like any carbineer." But Biron was obliged to raise the siege of Rouen; Parma entered the place and opened the navigation of the Seine by taking Caudebec, receiving there a wound which his ill-health rendered fatal. While he lay on his death-bed, Henry attacked his army at Yvetot, killed 3090 men, and shut up the army in a position which appeared to be desperate, between the Seine and the sea. "Vive Dieu," he cried with his accustomed gaiety, "if I have lost the kingdom of France, I am at least in possession of that of Yvetot." But the Duke of Parma extricated himself from this unhappy situation; boats, secretly built at Rouen, rapidly descended the Seine with the tide which ebbed as far as Caudebec. In a night the whole army passed to the other bank and regained the Low Countries without opposition. Parma was unable to proceed further than Arras, where he died. This able general had twice snatched

victory from the hands of the king and had thus retarded the end of the crisis.

The Sixteen. — Fortunately for Henry, the League itself assisted him. Since the suppression of the general council of Union, a severe contest had been continuously waged between Mayenne and the Sixteen, between the aristocratic and democratic sections of the League. The defeat of Mayenne and the first successes of Parma restored to the Sixteen the power they had lost for a time. They began loudly to accuse " the tyranny of the nobles and the injustice of the chiefs of justice, who ruined the authority and power of the ecclesiastics and the liberty of the people." Since the death of Guise at Blois, his son had been imprisoned in the château of Tours. He escaped in August, 1591, and hastened to Paris, full of the zeal and hatred which had grown up during his two years of captivity. The Sixteen thought that they had found in him a suitable leader; they dangled before his eyes the hope of marrying the daughter of Philip II. and ascending with her the throne of France.

Executions Ordered by the Sixteen: Demagogy of the League (1591).—During the final operations round Rouen the sermons in Paris had assumed a ferocious character. It was openly declared that a " day of the knife " was needed; others demanded " a new blood-letting " against the *Politiques*. Sinister figures appeared. On November 15, Bussy-Leclerc, Crucé, and the most zealous of the faction took up arms; appeared in the palace; arrested Brisson, the president, and the councillors Claude Larcher and Jean Tardif, whom they conducted to the Chatelet, where a priest and a hangman awaited them. Brisson demanded in vain that he should be put on bread and water within four walls, in order that he might finish a book which he had begun. He was hanged out of hand. These leaders of the parliament were at once partisans of Mayenne and of monarchical authority; their death was the signal for pillage and for the murder of a certain number of suspects. The aim of the conspirators was to assure themselves power to dominate the States which were about to assemble and to compel the election of a Catholic king who should be bound to establish the Inquisition in France, to respect the privileges of the clergy and commons, and to submit to resolutions passed by the States, which should henceforward meet once every five years. Their aim was thus, on the religious side, to introduce into France a system which had been fatal in the Spanish dominions; on the political side, to

destroy the great work of national unity which had been pursued for three centuries.

Rupture between Mayenne and the Sixteen.—On his return to Paris, Mayenne realised that he was lost if he could not stifle this ferocious demagogy. He surrounded the Bastille, from which Bussy-Leclerc had no time to escape, caused four of the Sixteen to be seized and decapitated, abolished their council, and entrusted the municipal offices to declared *Politiques* (February, 1592). The leaguers were dumbfounded. Boucher said in the duke's presence that it was "a veritable butchery, and that the victims were God's martyrs." The party of the League was from that moment wounded to death.

Mayenne had rendered a great service to France but not to himself. He did not attempt to restore to the League, when he had reduced it to discipline, the vigour of which he had deprived it. "Who would believe," he wrote to Villeroy, "that you fight for the Catholic faith and for the deliverance of the people, seeing God blasphemed as He is by your followers? Seeing all manner of impieties, sacrilege, robbery, rape, and other crimes committed without justice, restraint, or rule? Our towns are filled with confusion and poverty; our magistrates and officials are children and without authority; your soldiers live such licentious lives that they are hated by God and man."

States-General of the League: Pretensions of Philip II.: the Satire Ménippée.—It was clear to all that the war was no nearer an end. France might be ruined, but one party would not give way to the other before that. The idea of an agreement, a compromise, was now put forward; numerous negotiations took place, which went on in an underhand way in the midst of the conflict. They were directed only to discover upon what basis a compromise might be effected and who would profit from it. Each party rejected the idea of a States-General, relying rather on its own strength and fearing to submit to the scrutiny of an assembly its whole destiny. Yet the name remained on many lips; the writings and pamphlets of the two parties had so revolutionised opinion that the people did not know what to believe, and demanded that the voice of the nation itself should be heard. Boucher and Rose revived the memory of the elective character of royalty and exalted the rights of the people, in order that they might bring them under the control of the Church. The Protestants, who had become the champions of royal authority, declared for hereditary right, and opposed, both to papal and to popular claims, the divine right of kings.

The States, long since summoned but constantly postponed through the war, at last opened at Paris, in January, 1593. About 130 deputies appeared, mainly from the third estate. Philip II. relied on them. "Agents of the claimants to the crown," says l'Estoile, "could be seen night and day visiting the deputies and soliciting their votes." To arguments drawn from religion, Philip added others of a different kind. He had remarked that it would be easier to buy France than to conquer her, and he did not spare money; according to Spanish historians, he spent some 30,000,000 ducats. Henry of Navarre could count only on his heroes. In different circumstances they would have been enough to gain him the kingdom, but now his creed was an insuperable barrier, since the chief of the Protestants could never be king of the Catholics. Henry had long realised this and since he had never been firmly attached to Calvinism, he considered the plan of abandoning that faith in order that he might thus end a bloody war, which would otherwise be interminable. In comparison with the gold of the Spanish king, and the sacrifice which the legitimate heir seemed ready to make if he could cease to be king of a party and become King of France, Mayenne had little to offer. Yet he did not despair of succeeding by opposing Philip to Henry, the foreigner to the heretic, and, by keeping in the background himself, of supplanting both.

The deputies, nominated under the influence of Mayenne, were timid and alarmed at the sovereign powers conferred upon them, as they indicated by agreeing to a conference at Suresnes with the Catholics of the royalist party. To inspire them with the courage which they lacked, it was necessary to bring pressure to bear on them, but here the Duke of Feria, the Spanish ambassador, and Mayenne came into opposition. Henry of Navarre increased the uncertainty of the States by assembling at Mantes many prelates and doctors, both of the royalist party and of the party of Union, to consider the differences arising from the schism in the Church. Feria wished to hasten a decision before the assembly at Mantes could find some basis of agreement. On May 28, he laid before the States a formal proposition that they should elect as queen Isabella Clara Eugenia, daughter of Philip II. and grand-daughter by her mother of Henry II. "To break the Salic law is to destroy the kingdom," cried a leaguer. Mayenne demanded twelve days in which to consider the proposal; "the most important matter that could be discussed in Christendom." When the time had elapsed, the matter had hardly been further advanced. In the first session the

ambassador was urged to be more explicit; he was asked what husband Philip proposed for his daughter, and answered, "the Archduke Ernest of Austria." There was an outburst of murmurs, for some had counted on the choice of the young Duke of Guise. As it was, it was proposed to hand over France to a foreign prince and princess, to that house of Austria which French kings had fought for fifty years. Such was the proposal of the extremists of the League and the fire was lit.

As early as April 8 a preacher at St. Jacques la Boucherie had said, "There is no more religion among us; every one is actuated by ambition alone. What wonderful States are these! It is a court of King Pétaud, where every one desires to be master. There is not a governor among us who does not aspire to be a king, and they quarrel for the fragments of the realm." This soon became the general opinion, which found expression in a remarkable little pamphlet, the *Satire Ménippée*, the work of some Parisian bourgeois, Canon P. le Roy, Nicholas Rapin, Passerat, Pierre Pithou, and others, who accomplished the destruction of the League by ridicule. The *Catholicism of Spain*, the first part of the pamphlet, unmasked the ambition of Philip II., which he concealed under the mask of championship of Catholicism. In the *Summary of the States of the League* the mad ambition or shameless greed of all those who had played a great part in the Union was described. Finally, a deputy of the third estate, in an essay which reached the height of eloquence, enabled each to lay his finger on the moral of the pamphlet. "Paris, Paris, which is no more Paris, but a lair of wild beasts, a citadel of Spaniards, Walloons, and Neapolitans, a refuge for robbers, murderers, and assassins; you are delivered to the Spanish Inquisition, a fate a thousand times more intolerable to souls, born free and French, than the cruellest death."

Reason now began to rise from the storm of passions only half calmed. While the States continued those long discussions, which ill-concealed their indecision, some of the magistrates of the parliament took courage. "Behold the condition to which we are reduced," wrote one of them, du Vair, "when sixteen knaves are prepared to sell the French crown to the King of Spain. Never before have any statesmen played so licentiously, so boldly, with the destiny of so great and so powerful a realm; never have any bargained so publicly about so great a crown; never have any put up your lives, your goods, your honour, your liberty, so impudently to auction as these are doing to-day. And where are these men? They are in the very

heart of France." On the proposal of this brave magistrate, the parliament issued an ordinance which decreed that "remonstrances should be addressed to the lieutenant-general against the project of transferring the crown to any foreigner." This was the first example of good sense and patriotism which had been given for a long time. Henry IV. supplied the second.

Conversion of the King (1593): Entry of Henry IV. into Paris (1594).—The Spanish ambassador, realising that by demanding too much he had compromised his whole position, attempted to retreat. In the name of Philip II. he proposed the marriage of the Infanta to the Duke of Guise. But he was too late.

The people were now eager for peace, and the more so since, at this very moment, Henry IV. decided to take the final step. It must have cost the son of Jeanne d'Albret, the pupil of Coligny, not a little to break with those Huguenots, "who had borne him on their shoulders from beyond the Loire." But he obeyed the advice of the wisest even among the Protestants. On July 23, after a discussion of some hours with the Catholic divines assembled at Mantes, Henry declared himself to be convinced; despite his famous note to Gabrielle—"the day after to-morrow I shall accept a dangerous salvation"—he was convinced in truth. It was not a question of the truth of dogmas; with that he had no concern. He was convinced by the misfortunes of France. On July 25 he bid farewell, weeping, to the ministers of the creed which he was about to abandon, and escorted by the princes, the great officers of the crown, and a numerous body of nobles, he went to the church of St. Denis. The news reached Paris; despite the orders of Mayenne and of the municipal council a crowd of Parisians welcomed him on his way with shouts of "Vive le Roi!"

Having reached the door of the cathedral, he knocked. The Archbishop of Bourges appeared. "Who are you?" he asked. "I am the King." "What do you seek?" "To be received into the fold of the Catholic, apostolic, and Roman Church." He knelt and made his profession of faith. "I swear," he said, "in the presence of Almighty God, to live and die in the Catholic religion, to protect and defend it towards and against all men at the risk of my blood and life, and to renounce all heresies contrary to the same faith."

Some preachers of the League tried in vain to represent this act as a piece of hypocrisy. One pointed out that Henry had been a Huguenot one hour and a Catholic the next, hinting that he would attend mass first and then revert to a Calvinistic

service. To the majority, however, Henry's conversion was the pledge of a patriotic reconciliation. The States were defeated by a single blow. They declared that it was not within their competence to regulate the succession to the throne, renewed the oath of Union, ordered the publication of the decrees of the Council of Trent, and dispersed amid general indifference. In the provinces the reaction was pronounced. Lyons rose against the Duke of Nemours and displayed the white flag; Meaux, Peronne, Montdidier, Vitry, and Orleans overpowered their governors. The consecration of the king which took place at Chartres increased the reaction in his favour. Where popular feeling was not sufficient to secure his acceptance, Henry assisted the reaction by able negotiations, and thus bought Paris from Brissac by the gift of a marshal's bâton, the government of Mantes and Corbeil, and 200,000 crowns.

Brissac took care that nothing should impede Henry's march; he discharged or engaged in other ways those troops in whom he lacked confidence. On the morning of March 21, 4000 picked men appeared before the Porte St. Denis and the Porte Neuve. Some Germans posted there laid down their arms. The royalist troops advanced in good order into the centre of Paris and silently occupied the principal points, the people showing only a dull amazement. But when the king appeared and was received by Brissac and l'Huillier, the provost of the merchants, who was half smiling, half weeping, the bells burst into loud peals; cries of "Vive la paix! Vive le roi!" greeted him. Some leaguers who wished to resist were held in check by the civic guards. The Spanish garrison, quartered to the number of 3000 in the Faubourg St. Antoine, hoped to make some opposition there, but when it learned that the king had entered the Louvre and that the whole city was satisfied and peaceful, it was content to march out with the honours of war. The Spanish ambassador, the Duke of Feria, passing with them under the windows of the palace, gave the king only a "meagre" salute. "Gentlemen," said Henry, with his customary irony, "commend me to your master, but do not return." They should never have come. Villeroy, a leaguer, avowed that his party had only been able to carry on the war by the help of Philip's money and troops.

Submission of the Leaguers.—The king had possession of his capital where the parliament, purged and restored, abolished the decrees which had been issued against him and where the Sorbonne recognised him as the true and lawful monarch. But he had not the whole of France; the Spaniards were still in the

country and the principal members of the League were determined not to abandon the long struggle except with well-filled hands.

Henry at once marched against the Spaniards and Lorrainers, who were strongly posted in certain places on the northern frontier and especially at Laon. One of his most devoted supporters, Maximilien de Béthune, Baron de Rosny, afterwards Duke du Sully, was charged to negotiate with the rebels. The mere presence of the king was sufficient to gain Abbeville despite the presence of Aumale, Sens and Troyes despite the presence of the Lorrainers. Biron, son of the marshal who had lately died at Épernay, a man as brave and able as his father, began the blockade of Laon with 8000 men, defeated a relieving army from the Low Countries, and carried the town. Its reduction was followed by that of Amiens, Beauvais, Château-Thierry, and Cambrai.

The promises and money offered by Sully to the members of the League had more speedy results. Villars-Brancas handed over Rouen and Normandy in return for the post of admiral and a pension of 60,000 livres. The Duke of Guise handed over the places which he held in Champagne for a pension of 24,000 livres and the governorship of Provence; the Duke of Lorraine made his peace for 90,000 crowns and the government of Toul and Verdun. Henry IV. was one day congratulated that his loyal subjects had delivered up his kingdom to him. "Say, sold it," he cried. Sully estimated that it had cost thirty-two millions.

War with Spain: Battle of Fontaine-Française (1595).—That he might end the civil war more effectually, Henry began a foreign war. For more than twenty-five years Spain had taken a hand in all the troubles and misfortunes of France. She alone had perpetuated the resistance of the last leaguers; she alone retarded the grant of papal absolution to Henry IV. She was possibly privy to an attempt to murder the king. A young man, Jean Chatel, stabbed him in the throat; Henry, bending to embrace a noble, avoided the blow and was only wounded on the lip. Chatel had been a pupil of the Jesuits and had relations with many members of that society, who during the period of the League had been the most ardent supporters of Spanish pretensions. One of them was executed after Chatel; a parliamentary decree banished the rest from the kingdom (1595) "as disturbers of the public peace and corrupters of youth." Henry solemnly declared war against Philip in the same month (March).

Philip ordered Velasco, Governor of Milan, to enter Franche-Comté, and Fuentes, Governor of the Low Countries, to invade

Picardy. Henry attacked the former and in Burgundy once more exemplified his heroic daring. He and Marshal Biron were surprised by the enemy near Fontaine-Française, having only a handful of men with them. "Follow my example," the king cried, and risking his life ten times he stopped the Spanish advance, giving his troops time to come up. While he was on the Saone, Fuentes arrived on the Somme, entered Ham, Catelet, and Doullens, which he sacked, and caused Cambrai to surrender from fear of a like fate.

Absolution of the King (September, 1595).—The arrival of the long-sought papal absolution for Henry made up for these reverses. Philip II. threatened in vain. "Clement VII. lost England by too much haste," said a cardinal; "Clement VIII. must not lose France by too much delay." Duperron and D'Ossat, the king's two ambassadors, abjured heresy in the name of Henry and promised that the decrees of the Council of Trent should be published, all except those which might excite disturbance. The great penitentiary then touched the heads of the kneeling ambassadors with his wand and the pope pronounced the formula of absolution amid the applause of the people. The king fulfilled the duties of a good Catholic fully and minutely. At mass he was a cause of edification to the faithful; during the longest sermon he showed no weariness; and on Easter Day he touched for the king's evil. No more orthodox prince could be found anywhere.

Submission of Mayenne, Épernon, and Joyeuse (1596).—This event led Mayenne to make his submission. He handed over the last places which he held and received in exchange the government of Burgundy, three cautionary towns, and 335,000 crowns. The first interview between the former enemies took place at the château of Monceaux in Brie. Henry embraced Mayenne, took him by the arm, and walked with him rapidly to and fro in the gardens. Mayenne, who was fat and heavy, perspired and became breathless and exhausted. Henry stopped and offered him his hand. "Take it, my friend," he said, "this is the only injury you will ever receive from me." It was actually the only revenge he took on the chief of the League. Mayenne served him with fidelity from that day; he possibly saved the royal army before Amiens, when it was surprised by his former allies, the Spaniards. His nephew, the Duke of Guise, did still better. He recovered Provence and Marseilles from the troops of the Duke of Savoy, of Philip II., and of the rebels. Épernon, the leader of the rebels, found a way to make excellent terms

for himself. Before laying down his arms, he stipulated that he should be granted the governments of Angoumois, Saintonge, Limousin, and Périgord. Joyeuse secured the grant of Languedoc. The king refused nothing, feeling sure he would one day regain all that he had granted, when he had restored order to the country, which had been left in a state of chaos by the League.

Assembly of Notables at Rouen (1596).—But it was necessary to find means and for this purpose Henry convoked an assembly of notables at Rouen. He addressed them with that brusque good humour which concealed his craft and which won hearts for him. "If I were anxious to gain the title of orator, I would have learned a beautiful and lengthy speech, and delivered it gravely enough. But, gentlemen, my desire is to secure two more glorious titles, those of the liberator and restorer of the state. For this purpose, I have summoned you. You know to your cost—as I, whom God has called to wear this crown, know to my cost—that France is not only well-nigh ruined, but that the French people have lost almost everything. By the grace of God, by the prayers and good service of those who are unable to bear arms for me, by the sword of my brave and generous nobles, from whom I do not distinguish the princes, since the noblest title among us is *foi de gentilhomme*, by my own toil and labour, I have saved my country at this time from destruction. Share then, my dear subjects, in this second glorious work, as you have shared in the first. I have not called you together, as my predecessors called you, to register their will, but that you may aid me with your advice, which I will receive and follow; in short, that I may place myself under your tutelage, a thing which it is not easy for kings, for greybeards, for conquerors to do. But the eager desire that I have to add those two fair titles to that of king, and the great love which I bear towards my subjects, makes everything easy and honourable for me."

Henry had no wish to be taken at his word. Gabrielle showed her astonishment when he spoke of placing himself under tutelage. "It is true," he answered, "but, ventre saint-gris![1] I will hear them with my sword at my side." He had no less exalted an idea of his power than had other kings, his contemporaries. This prince, who had been so amiable at Rouen, answered the remonstances of his parliament one day in words which were far removed from the gentle speech of Henry of Navarre: "My will must be your reason; no other reason may be asked

[1] A favourite oath of Henry IV.

of a prince in an obedient state. I am king. I speak to you as your king. I will be obeyed." And he was obeyed. Under the ruin caused by so many wars, Henry found and revived with success the absolute power founded by Francis I., because neither the sacerdotal democracy of the League nor the greedy feudal ambition of the nobles had been able to establish durable liberty. While they disputed about heaven, they lost the earth. They had been filled with passion; they had no political ideas, and when their passions had been quenched or subdued people and nobles alike found themselves face to face with the monarchy which claimed all power. The assembly at Rouen was useless. Impracticable plans were put forward and Henry was left free to carry out his own. He had better advice than that which the nobles might have given him; he had Sully, the personified genius of order.

Surprise of Amiens (1597): Submission of Mercœur.—But the time for reforms had not come, since that of trial had not yet passed. In 1596 the Spaniards had taken Calais and this blow struck sadness into the heart of France. Next year, they entered Amiens. The inhabitants had refused to receive a royal garrison. Portocarrero, the Spanish Governor of Doullens, informed that the citizens kept good watch at night, but bad watch during the day, formed an ambuscade with 4000 picked men near the walls. When the gate was opened in the morning, peasants laden with sacks appeared; one left his open, a quantity of nuts rolled from it over the ground, and the guards scrambled for them, laughing. At the same time a carriage arrived; when it was under the gate, in such a way as to prevent the lowering of the portcullis, the driver cut the traces. The sham peasants then drew their swords and pistols, which had been hidden under their smocks, and killed the guard. Their comrades hastened up and the city was taken. Henry was in his capital, in the midst of fêtes, when he heard that the Spaniards were at Amiens, thirty leagues from Paris. "I have been King of France long enough," he cried, "it is time for me to be King of Navarre." He buckled on his cuirass and hastened to Amiens with Biron, his excellent artillery, all the northern nobles, and more than 20,000 men. Rosny had promised to keep him well supplied with food and munitions and he did so. An army which came from the Low Countries to raise the siege returned without effecting anything. Amiens surrendered in September. The rapidity of these operations still further increased the king's reputation abroad and proved the strength of France. Mercœur, a prince

of Lorraine who had created a kind of principality for himself in Brittany, had for four years delayed his submission. Seeing the royalist army marching against him he judged it prudent to make peace before it reached his district. He sent away the Spaniards whom he had received at Blavet and obtained terms which scandalised Sully; he had offered his vast inheritance and the hand of his daughter to Caesar of Vendôme, son of Gabrielle d'Estrées and the king. He seemed to resign his government voluntarily in favour of his son-in-law and received pensions and pardon for himself and his partisans (February, 1598). He was the last of the leaguers. The civil war was ended.

Edict of Nantes (April 13, 1598).—Some days later, Henry ended the religious conflict by the pacification which bears the title of the Edict of Nantes. From the moment of his conversion, the Calvinists had been offended with him. Many Protestant lords had followed his example, but the majority had refused, and the ministers who placed themselves at the head of the Huguenot party in place of the soldiers showed themselves less tractable. In vain the king flattered them with that easy good nature and geniality by which he won hearts; he had here to deal with serious convictions and with men of character, who were not to be bent by the pressure of self-interest. One day, when d'Aubigné came to greet his old master, Henry received him with open arms; he presented him to Gabrielle d'Estrées, and caused him to embrace her children. The Huguenot remained silent. To break the ice, Henry spoke of the dangers through which he had passed, and showed him his lip wounded by the dagger of Jean Chatel. Then at last d'Aubigné spoke and before the woman and her children he said, "Sire, as you have denied God with your lips, you have been wounded in the lip; when you have denied Him in your heart, you will be wounded to the heart." But the leaders had had enough of war. Henry offered them good and fair terms, such as l'Hôpital had promised them thirty-six years before, more especially liberty of conscience, freedom of worship within the châteaux, in all towns where the reformed faith was already established or at least in one town in every bailiwick. The schools were opened to the Protestants, and all public offices made accessible to them. Places of security were given to them, and chambers, equally composed of Catholics and Protestants, were to try all suits in which Huguenots were concerned in the parliaments of Paris, Toulouse, Grenoble, and Bordeaux. Finally, by a provision which created a state within a state, their right of assembly was recognised; every

three years their deputies might meet to present their complaints to the government. This edict proclaimed the modern principle of toleration in matters of religion, and the corollary that the state should hold aloof from religious disputes, in order to impose on all respect for the public peace. It marks the definite breach with the Middle Ages.

Treaty of Vervins (1598).—Nineteen days later, the representatives of the king signed a peace with Spain at Vervins. Philip II., defeated by England, by the United Provinces, and by the man whom he chose to call "the Prince of Béarn," saw, after all his efforts, his ambition thwarted and his monarchy, like himself, worn out and dying. He desired at least to end his reign in peace. The Treaty of Vervins restored those frontiers which had been established forty years before by the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis. France and Spain both appeared to have returned to the starting point. But the one state was left without energy, almost without life; the other was full of youth and ardour. The sombre despotism of Philip II. had hurried Spain into a decay from which succeeding centuries have hardly availed to free her. The reign of Henry IV. began, by the conciliation of all parties, one of the great periods of French history. Terrible calamities had fallen on France during the previous forty years, but two great problems had been solved. France remained a Catholic country, without the Inquisition; and the monarchy, which then held in its hands the future destiny of the country, did not fall back five centuries into the hands of feudal and municipal anarchy.

Acquisition of Bresse and Bugey (1604).—The Duke of Savoy had profited by the embarrassment of France to seize the marquisate of Saluzzo in 1588. Henry demanded its restoration, and on the duke's refusal, declared war (1600). He easily took the places which the duke held on the right bank of the Rhône and forced him to cede, in exchange for the valueless marquisate, Bresse, Bugey, Valromey, and the Pays de Gex, all the district between Lyons and Geneva, as well as Château-Dauphin in the Alps. The acquisitions were small, but they assured two great advantages to France, protecting Lyons on the side of Switzerland and intercepting the communications between Franche-Comté, a Spanish possession, and Savoy, of which the duke was under the control of the Spanish Governor of Milan. Previously Milan and Besançon had touched through the territories of the Duke of Savoy; now France intervened between them.

TWELFTH PERIOD—RESTORATION OF INTERNAL ORDER BY THE MONARCHY, AND THE SECOND STRUGGLE OF FRANCE AGAINST THE HOUSE OF AUSTRIA

(1598–1659)

CHAPTER XLVII

REORGANISATION OF FRANCE BY HENRY IV. (1598–1610)

State of France.—By 1598, Henry IV. had expelled the foreigner, reconciled Catholics and Protestants, and restored peace at home and abroad. It remained to heal the wounds of France. "I have hardly a horse," wrote Henry in 1596, "on which I can fight; my doublet is out at elbows, and my saucepan is often empty." The country resembled the king. As early as 1580, a contemporary estimated that 800,000 persons had perished in war and massacre; that nine cities had been razed, 250 villages burned, 128,000 houses destroyed. That was before the days of the League; much greater loss had been suffered after that date. Workshops were without work, commerce was interrupted, agriculture was at a standstill, brigandage was rife everywhere. Such was the condition from which Henry IV. had to rescue France. The nobles proposed a plan by which he might end this dire distress. They offered him all the money needed for the work of government and for the maintenance of an army on condition merely that "those who held governments by royal grant should receive them as hereditary possessions, recognising the authority of the crown by making simple liege homage, as had been the case in the past." This was exactly the state of affairs against which the monarchy had fought and over which it had gradually triumphed in the last two centuries, and Henry IV. was as little disposed as any of his predecessors had been to restore feudalism. It was, on the contrary, in order to deliver France from the hands of these "tyrants," in order to rule her himself, that he undertook to revive her strength.

Sully.—He had already found a man who could aid him in this task, a task far more difficult than that of winning battles. He was the Protestant Maximilien de Béthune, later Duke of Sully, a man of sound common sense, with a clear and just mind, an intrepid heart, an iron character. Sully was born in 1560 at the château of Rosny near Mantes, being seven years younger than the king. At the time of St. Bartholomew he was studying in Paris; his tutor and valet were killed. Wearing his scholar's gown and with a book of hours under his arm, which served him as a passport with the murderers, he sought refuge in the chief college of Burgundy, where he lay hidden for three days. He attached himself to the King of Navarre, followed him through all his adventures and battles, showing himself to be as brave as the best. He was often wounded; at Ivry it was supposed that he was mortally wounded, and the king, meeting him, embraced him with both arms, as a brave soldier, a true and frank knight. He was not, however, a knight of the pattern of Bayard, for if he looked well after his master's interests, he did not forget his own. He married a rich heiress, a Courtenay; he did not despise the profits of war, in the shape of a share in the pillage of towns or the ransoms of leaders. He had not even a soul above trade; he sold horses which he had bought cheaply in Germany at a high price in Gascony, and he established as much system in his household expenses as in the public finances. But he was devoted to the king and the state; the good estate manager cut down his woods at Rosny to give the price to Henry, then at the end of his resources; the zealous Protestant advised the king to end the war by becoming a Catholic. Sully was neither a Colbert nor a Bayard, but he had some of the qualities of each.

In 1596 Henry included him in his financial council. The old members leagued zealously against the newcomer. The financial administration was obscure, the obscurity being intentionally increased by those who found it to be to their interest to work in the dark. Sully was able to reveal their frauds and after the Peace of Vervins he was given the post of superintendent of finances and grand overseer of roads (1599); he was later given the post of grand-master of ordnance (1600). In the court, which preserved some of the licence which had marked that of the later Valois, Sully preserved his probity and his morals as well as his religion. He was the friend as well as the minister of the king; he often opposed him that he might serve him better, and he showed himself merciless towards all who endeavoured to live at the public expense.

Financial Reforms.—Sully loved no better than his master "to increase by edicts the volumes of ordinances"; but if he legislated little, he administered much. He had the glory of having realised, two centuries in advance, some of the principles which regulated the financial administration of France in the nineteenth century. The disorder of the finances was extreme. The public debt was estimated—the exact figure was unknown—at 345 millions. The country paid annually more than 170 millions, without including seigniorial dues and feudal statutes. The net revenue hardly amounted to 30 millions, of which 19 millions had to be set aside to meet the obligations of the state. Almost all the royal demesne was alienated. Fraud reigned in the administration from the highest to the lowest. The state did not know exactly what it ought to receive, nor even what it did receive, so confused were the records of receipt, so great the pilfering. Sully determined to have an account for every penny: he established registers; balanced receipts and expenditure; drew up a statement of all the resources of the kingdom by provinces and by the branches of the public service; fixed the amount of annual expenditure by prohibiting the chamber of accounts from passing payments which were in excess of the sums settled by him. The receipts from the *cinq grosses fermes*[1] and from the *gabelle* were thus almost doubled without any new charge being imposed on the people. A chamber of justice prosecuted fraudulent officials; the collectors were compelled to render exact accounts and to produce evidence of their accuracy. But while he imposed upon them the rendering of statements which facilitated control over them, he did not introduce the system of dual returns, which was practised to advantage in commerce. The governors levied taxes arbitrarily on their provinces, the lords on their vassals. Sully cut short the profits of all these thieves and the royal taxes increased in value. Épernon, who thus raised a revenue of 60,000 crowns, tried to resist. Sully was said to manage finance like a soldier. He revised all lists of debts due, annulled many and reduced the rate of interest from $8\frac{1}{3}$ to $6\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. He caused an account to be drawn up of all the tenants of public lands and raised their rents. A number of useless offices, fraudulent pensions, and illegal immunities were suppressed; others were reduced in value. Many who had bought the status of nobility were once more included in the number of those liable to the *taille*. The

[1] The *cinq grosses fermes* comprised all the moneys from treaties and from customs.

hereditary nature of offices, officially recognised in 1604 by the creation of the *paulette*,[1] was a less satisfactory measure than the rest, but it was in the interest of the royal revenue. To severe supervision of receipts, Sully added a wise economy in expenses. By the end of the reign of Henry IV., 147 million livres of debt had been paid off, the demesnes had been recovered for 80 millions, 8 millions of interest had been saved, taxation had been reduced from 30 millions to 26 millions, of which 20 millions came into the treasury. Forty millions had been spent on fortifications and public works, the expenses of each year were assured, a reserve of 20 millions had been amassed.

Agriculture.—Economy preserves but does not increase wealth. Henry IV. and Sully looked for such increase to agriculture, commerce, and industry, the king relying equally on all these three sources, the minister giving his attention mainly to agriculture. "Labour in the fields and pasturage," he says in his *Économies royales*, "are the two udders from which France may be nourished, the true mines and treasures of Peru." He twice made a tour of the provinces in order to study personally the needs of the country, and caused the issue of the great ordinance of 1600 which remitted to the people the arrears of the *taille* to the amount of 20 millions and reduced the land tax by 1,800,000 livres. In 1596 he revived the ancient prohibition of the seizure of the persons of labourers, their instruments of labour or beasts, for public or private debts. Severe ordinances imposed the death penalty on soldiers who ranged over the country, on all who were found in possession of arms, unless they were in the service of the king or of some gentleman. Finally in 1601, Sully allowed the exportation of corn, a bold measure for the period and well calculated to enrich rather than to impoverish the country. He favoured the draining of marshes. All land reclaimed from water became noble, not subject to the *taille*. The canton of Médoc was formed in this way; it was called *Petite Flandre*, on account of the great number of Flemish labourers employed on this work under the direction of the Brabançon Bradley, the *master of the dykes*.

A Protestant gentleman of Languedoc, Olivier de Serre, has deserved the title of the *father of French agriculture* by the precepts which he laid down in his *Théâtre de l'agriculture* and in his *Ménage des champs*, and which he himself put into practice on a model farm. When Henry IV. received his book he ordered that some pages of it should be read to him

[1] A duty paid to the king by the officers of justice and of finance.

every day after dinner for three or four months. Many read and followed its advice, for the nobility, idle since the end of the civil war, lived on their estates and not yet in the royal antechamber. Henry told them bluntly that it would be better for them to go to their houses and to set their lands in order. And so production made rapid progress; in the first half of the seventeenth century French agriculture was the first in Europe. There was not a single famine from 1598 to 1626.

Industry and Commerce.—Sully held with Pliny, *ex agricultura strenuissimi milites*, the farm is the best recruiting ground. He feared that industry would make the French unaccustomed to active life, to the open air from which health and strength were derived, and that the indoor life of the manufacturer would cause the national physique to degenerate. He was thus opposed to the introduction of foreign foodstuffs and of foreign industries, believing that God gave to each land abundance and lack of certain things, "in order that, by commerce and traffic in these commodities, the intercourse, association, and accord of nations might be maintained." Henry IV. was of a different opinion; he tried to encourage in France the growing of mulberry trees and the cultivation of silk-worms. The Tuileries and the open space of the Tournelles were planted with mulberries; he wished that there might be a silk manufactory in every *election* (constituency) and began with the *généralités* (districts) of Paris, Orleans, and Tours, in order to free France from her annual payment of 4,000,000 gold crowns to Italy for silk. A similar idea appears in the foundation of manufactories of the fine crape of Bologna, of the gold thread of Milan, of which 12,000,000 crowns worth was annually imported into France; of tapestries, of gilded leather, glass, crystal, linen after the Dutch pattern, and so forth. It was a better way of keeping gold in the kingdom than that of the prohibitions by which Sully sought to prevent it from being paid out. That minister was entirely opposed to these "baubles"; he gave way only before the absolute will of the king. In 1604 the king assembled a chamber of commerce, in which there was proposed, among other things, a general reform of the trade corporations and the establishment of a stud-farm in France to prevent the necessity of purchasing war-horses in Germany, Spain, Turkey, and England.

Marine and Colonies.—The navy, which had been developed under Francis I., had fallen so low that in 1596 Cardinal d'Ossat wrote to Villeroy, "The humblest princeling of Italy, though the majority of them possess but an inch of sea apiece, have

yet galleys in their arsenals, while a great kingdom, bordering on two seas, has no means of defending itself by sea against corsairs and pirates, still less against hostile princes." D'Ossat pointed out at the same time the importance of the harbour of Toulon. Sully had no objection to a navy, though distant colonies alarmed him. The views of Henry IV. were wider than those of his minister. To encourage commerce with North America he sent Champlain, a gentleman of Saintonge, to Canada, where he founded Port Royal (Annapolis) in 1604, and later Quebec on the St. Lawrence (1608). Champlain has given his name to one of the great lakes of that country, but the land itself is no longer French, though it preserves in places the French language and sweet memories of the motherland. Henry also wished to create an India Company, able to rival those founded in England and Holland. He had no time to realise this idea, but he signed a treaty with Turkey by which it was agreed that all Christian nations should trade freely with the Levant under the flag and protection of France, all nations recognising the jurisdiction of the French consuls. The French flag alone was respected on the Barbary coasts. When foreign states excluded French ships from their harbours by the imposition of heavy harbour dues, Henry IV. had recourse to reprisal to the great profit of his own marine, an idea afterwards adopted by Colbert and Fouquet.

Public Works: Canal of Briare.—One may still see on the French hills old elms which the peasants call *Rosnis*. They are the remains of the plantations made along the roads constructed by Sully, who was well aware that the most fertile land remains poor if its means of communication are bad. The plan of the great canals which have since been built in France was formed at this time. One alone could be made, that of Briare, the most ancient example outside Italy of a canal with locks. Its length is fifty-five kilometres, and by means of forty locks it reaches a height of 117 metres. It leaves the Loire at Briare and enters the Seine near Moret, a pretty little town on the Loing, which gave its name to a county and to one of Henry IV.'s sons.

Army.—The territorial regiments formed by Francis I. and Henry II. had not been entirely destroyed; some companies remained which were united. There were only four such regiments commanded by colonels in 1595. Henry IV. raised their number to eleven, Louis XIII. to thirty. But the custom of hiring foreign mercenaries continued. The cavalry formed too great a proportion of the army, since the nobles would serve in no

other arm. The military household of the king was a picked body of men. The artillery, in the hands of Sully, acquired such importance that the grand-master of ordnance was included among the great officers of state. After 1572, all lords were forbidden to have cannon in their châteaux without permission from the king. Sully introduced the monthly distribution of pay; previously it had been distributed twice or four times a year. The superintendent of fortresses dates from 1558, that of supplies from 1577. These two important services had formerly been left to chance and were now regulated. Sully supervised them carefully; he repaired a number of fortresses and filled the arsenals which the civil wars had emptied. Henry IV. formed the idea, which Louis XIV. realised so gloriously, of assuring a refuge to old soldiers, but his *Hôpital de la Charité* in the rue de l'Ourcine did not survive him.

Arts and Letters under Henry IV.: Gallery of the Louvre: Hôtel de Ville of Paris.—Without loving the arts like Francis I., Henry II., or Charles IX., Henry IV. understood that they would throw glory on his reign. He therefore accepted the heritage of the Renaissance, which had already reached its decadence; he caused much work to be done on the château of Fontainebleau, the baptistery of which was built at the time of the dauphin's birth. At St. Germain, Francis had built a fortress rather than a pleasure house; Henry built a new château there, of which only a single pavilion remains. He began two new pavilions at the Tuileries and wished to continue it till it joined the great gallery of the Louvre, passing over the walls of the city, that he might not be shut up in his palace as Henry III. had been. He had no time to complete this magnificent work. His architect was wise enough to carry out, in part of this work, the original plan. The same architect, Androuet Ducerceau, completed the façade of the Hôtel de Ville, the foundation of which had been laid under Francis I., and the Pont Neuf, which had been begun under Henry III. In 1601 the first stone of St. Croix at Orleans was laid and in 1604 that of the Place Royale at Paris, in which there was a mingling of brick, stone, and slate, the last being borrowed from old Italian architecture. Already the heavy, low arch replaced the square doors and rounded angles of the Renaissance; the stone cross was no longer found in the windows, which were bare and cold in aspect with a large expanse of glass.

It was not only in the arts that the capricious freedom of the Renaissance was abandoned. Method, regularity, and law

was replacing in everything the bold and often anarchical independence, powerful and original though it was, which had marked the sixteenth century. In politics, royal authority already wielded to some extent that power which Richelieu and Louis XIV. made absolutely irresistible. There arose also a king of literature, a Richelieu of grammar, a "tyrant of words and syllables," admitting these and excluding those, in the person of Malherbe, a literary genius of good taste rather than a great poet. After the lively and attractive works of Marot and Rabelais, the heirs of the old Gallic spirit; after Ronsard, who drew his grammar and his words from antiquity; after Montaigne, Malherbe was the regulator of expressions and ideas, a worthy precursor of Boileau, and the first Frenchman who

"D'un mot mis à sa place enseigna le pouvoir."

He produced little—a few odes and stanzas—though his life was long; but in the majority of his works he attained perfection of form and some of his works are models in thought and sentiment. He fixed the style and language of poetry in France which was followed by Corneille, Racine, and Boileau.

With his fantastic energy, Mathurin Régnier the satirist revolted against him, accusing him of not knowing

"Que proser de la rime et rimer de la prose."

The revolt was vain. Discipline prevailed in letters as in the state. Régnier wrote his satires in verse, as Rabelais had written a vast satire in prose. But Rabelais had attacked everything; Régnier, the literary heir of Marot, with more malice and a style which often reaches perfection, only touches on the foolish sides of character and does not go below the surface of things. The verse and prose of d'Aubigné, his *Tragiques* and his *Mémoires*, are not so much literary works as political records; the fierce Protestant continued with his pen the fight which he had fought so valiantly with his sword.

The only prose work which French literature has preserved between Montaigne and Descartes, the *Satire Ménippée*, has already been mentioned.

Popularity of the King: Conspiracies.—The care which Henry IV. showed for the welfare of France acquired for him a legitimate popularity. The brilliant qualities of his mind and heart served to hide his weaknesses which the people readily pardoned. They were anxious to see in him the king who provided an asylum for old soldiers, the "fowl in his pot" for the peasant every Sunday, the king who said to an ambassador, who was aston-

ished at the prosperity of the kingdom, so miserable a few years before, "There was no father of this family then; now there is a father who cares for his children and everything prospers."

But if the people blessed him, certain parties and certain individuals whom his grand policy wounded severely did not do so. The favour shown to Gabrielle d'Estrées, whom he created Duchess of Beaufort, and to Henriette d'Entraigues, whom he made Marchioness of Verneuil; as well as forgotten promises, services rendered to the King of Navarre which the King of France was unable to repay, caused some to murmur and led others to plot.

The most famous of these plots was that of the Marshal Biron. The foreigner also had a hand in it. The Duke of Savoy, threatened with the loss of Bresse, and Spain, which had no more soldiers but enough money to pay for unlimited intrigues, tried to excite the French nobles to rebellion. They, having known the king as a poor gentleman, only obeyed him with regret. A plot was organised. It was proposed to restore France to the condition in which it had been under Charles VI., the governors of provinces were to become masters of their governments under the protection of Spain. Any means to this end appeared to be good. The Catholic king offered Dauphiné and several western provinces to the Huguenots in order to bring them into the affair, but they distrusted the friendly offers of those who had lately murdered their friends and remained quiet. But the proud Biron, who, created marshal, duke, peer, and Governor of Burgundy, still regarded his reward as inadequate, permitted himself to be led away. Once, in 1600, Henry pardoned him, and he would have done so again if Biron had agreed to make the confessions demanded from him. Angered by his obstinacy and wishing to give to the nobles one of those examples of which Richelieu gave so many, Henry allowed sentence to be executed and Biron was beheaded (1602). An old friend of the king, the Duke of Bouillon, was implicated in this plot, but fled in time. The father and brother of Henriette intrigued with Spain and were condemned to death, but the king's mistress secured a commutation of the penalty (1604).

Scheme for the Reorganisation of Europe.—Spain, unable to make war, made plots. She may have had reason for fearing Henry, since it is suggested that the power of the house of Austria, mistress of so much territory and so strongly supported by Catholic Europe, was the continual subject of the king's thoughts; its destruction his dream. It is even suggested

that he went further; that his schemes were ennobled by their ultimate aim—the establishment in Europe of a political system which should place the independence of creeds and nations under the guarantee of all the states. According to Henry's "Great Idea," the house of Austria was to be deprived of the Low Countries, Italy, and Germany, to be permitted to form in Hungary, increased by the Austrian provinces, a powerful state capable of checking the Turks, if they were not relegated to Asia. Lombardy was to be given to the Duke of Savoy; Sicily to Venice. The remainder of Italy was to be formed into a single state with the pope at its head, with the exception of Genoa and Florence and the small lordships lying near them which were to constitute a republic. Another republic was to be established in the Low Countries, the Swiss Confederation was to be extended over Tyrol, and Germany was to remain an elective empire. Europe was thus to contain six hereditary kingdoms, France, Spain, England, Sweden, Denmark, and Lombardy; five elective states, Poland, Hungary, Bohemia, the Empire, and the Papacy; four republics, Venice, Genoa-Florence, Switzerland, and the Netherlands. It would itself form a great republic, with a supreme council to which the deputies of all the states should come, and which would have the function of preventing injustice and wars. The reign of law was to replace that of force. This alleged project contained the application of the great principle of nationality. To prove the disinterested nature of his ideas, Henry, in the general reorganisation of Europe, demanded nothing for France except that which it might seem to be right to accord to her. "Those who speak Spanish should remain under the rule of the King of Spain, those who speak English under the rule of the King of England; but I ought to rule those who speak French." He aspired to Savoy, which its duke should abandon on receiving Lombardy; to Lorraine, the heiress of which he would marry to the dauphin; and to Belgium and Franche-Comté which had no reason for belonging to Spain.

It is improbable that even if Henry formed any such elaborate plans he had any hope of attaining their complete realisation. But for the accomplishment of some part of the design he was able to rely on the help of England, Elizabeth being until her death on friendly terms with France. He could rely also on the Duke of Savoy, to whom he offered Lesdiguières' force of 15,000 men which was already encamped in Dauphiné, on the sole condition that he would create a kingdom for himself out of

Spanish Lombardy. He might count too on the Protestants of the Netherlands, whom he supported against the Spaniards, and on those of Germany, who had recently formed the *Evangelical Union* and one of whose chief leaders, Maurice, Landgraf of Hesse, visited France to confer with him. He even formed a connection with the Moriscoes of Spain, who were then under the terror of the Inquisition. The Duke of Clèves and Juliers died at this time leaving "everything to his heir." Protestants and Catholics disputed this rich inheritance and Henry had thus a pretext for intervening and beginning a war which the growing rivalry of the two creeds within the empire rendered inevitable. Elaborate preparations were made; the armies were assigned their points for assembling; a force of 40,000 men advanced towards the frontiers of Champagne, accompanied by powerful artillery. All France and all Germany, feeling that great events were at hand, fumed with impatience when the hero, upon whom all depended, was assassinated.

Assassination of Henry IV.—The alliances which Henry had formed with the Protestants, the Moriscoes, and the Turks greatly alarmed the Catholics. It was in vain that the king sought the friendship of the pope by marrying, after divorcing Marguerite de Valois, the niece of the pontiff, Marie de Medici. It was in vain that, having permitted the Jesuits to return to France in 1603, he selected his confessor from that society, built the college of La Flèche for them, and granted to their masters the right to teach. He was none the less, in the eyes of many, the foe of religion, and that this was his character was the conviction of a fanatic called Francis Ravaillac.

Henry IV. was restless and sad. Rumours of plots against him were incessant; nineteen attempts to murder him had already been foiled and he had grounds for fearing a twentieth. Before leaving for the war, he gave way to the insistence of the queen, who wished to be consecrated. "Ah, my friend," he said to Sully, "this consecration displeases me. Ah! cursed consecration! you will be the cause of my death. They will kill me; for I see well that they have no other means of escaping from their danger than through my death." Yet he returned safely from this ceremony, though he could not shake off his dark forebodings. "You may not believe me," he remarked to some of his lords, "but I shall die one of these days, and when you have lost me, you will realise what I was worth to you and the difference between me and other men."

On May 14, his son Vendôme told him that, according to astrological predictions, that day would be fatal to him. Henry affected to laugh, but was troubled and unable either to work or to sleep. "Your Majesty should go out and take the air; it will revive you," said one of his guards. "You are right; bring me my cuirass," he answered. As the weather was hot, he wore an open cuirass. He rode with the Dukes of Épernon, Montbazon, and five other nobles, practically without an escort, only some gentlemen on horseback and valets on foot following him. He went in the direction of the Arsenal, where he wished to see Sully who was ill. As he passed along the Rue St. Honoré into the Rue de la Ferronnerie, a crush of carriages delayed him. Ravaillac had followed him on foot from the Louvre; he jumped on a pillar and struck the king. "I am wounded," he cried, raising his arm. By this movement he bared his left side, the assassin struck a second blow which reached the heart. The king fell back without uttering a cry; he was dead. Ravaillac made no attempt to escape and there was great difficulty in preventing the people from tearing him to pieces. Shut up near the place, in the Hôtel de Retz, he appeared to be forgotten there, and many were able to see and speak to him. Parliament quickly finished his trial; he was condemned to exquisite tortures; his breasts and limbs were to be cut off; he was to have molten lead and boiling oil poured on him; to have his right hand burned off in a sulphur fire; and finally to be quartered, his remains being burned and thrown to the winds. The quartering, says the account of the proceedings, lasted a full hour. The judges were unable to discover, or did not dare to discover, any accomplices.

Miscellaneous Facts.—An ordinance of 1609 ordered the actors of the two theatres which then existed to play their pieces at two o'clock and at half-past four, since the streets of Paris were unsafe in the evening; they had no lamps, much mud, few carriages, many robbers. In 1634, the policing of Paris was entrusted to 240 archers, half for the day and half for the night.

CHAPTER XLVIII

LOUIS XIII. (1610–1643)

Regency of Marie de Medici.—Sully was waiting for Henry IV. at the Arsenal, when a gentleman of his suite rushed in, crying, "The king is mortally wounded." "My God!" cried Sully, "have compassion on him, on us, and on the state. If he dies, France will fall into strange hands." He at once shut himself up in the Bastille and wrote to his son-in-law, the Duke of Rohan, to return in all haste from Champagne with the 6000 Swiss whom he commanded.

Louis XIII. was not yet nine years old. Custom conferred the regency upon the king's mother, but Marie de Medici, who was a foreigner and who felt that she was little loved, felt it necessary to secure some kind of legal sanction for her authority. She turned to the parliament of Paris, as if these magistrates were the representatives of the country. Épernon entered the hall of the parliament wearing his sword, having left his soldiers at the door. "This sword," he said proudly, "is still in its scabbard, but if the queen is not instantly declared regent, I see that it will be necessary to draw it." The magistrates obeyed; at a later date, they remembered that a queen had recognised their right to dispose of power.

At first nothing appeared to be changed in the political system of France. Marie de Medici retained the ministers of the late king. She even received Sully with deference, who left the Bastille in order to greet the new king at the Louvre. "My son," she said to the young prince, "this is M. de Sully; you must love him well, for he was one of the best and most valuable servants of the king, your father; you should beg him to serve you as he served your father." Sully, in tears, held the son of his master and friend in his arms in a long embrace. The policy of the late king, as well as of his ministers, seemed to be maintained. A royal declaration confirmed the Edict of Nantes, and an army of 10,000 men, commanded by Marshal de la Châtre, was sent to seize Juliers on behalf of the Protestant princes allied to France.

Abandonment of the Policy of Henry IV.: Concini.—It soon became clear that the government was marked by the weakness, irresolution, and caprice of a woman. With the king a minor,

an incapable regent, a divided court, and turbulent princes, the action of France abroad was for a long time neutralised. Peace became a necessity. Marie de Medici entered into relations with Spain; she resumed a project which Henry IV. had abandoned by opening negotiations for a double marriage of her son with a Spanish princess and of a Spanish prince with her daughter, and she promised "not to trouble further the affairs of the Austrian house in Germany." It was difficult for Sully to adopt this policy, and the queen dismissed him, leaving him only the position of grand-master of artillery (1611). He lived for thirty years longer, dying at the end of 1641 in his château of Villebon.

The queen had long given her confidence to a Florentine, Concino Concini, who ruled her through his wife, Leonora Galigaï. This woman, the daughter of a carpenter, was the queen's foster-sister. Educated with Marie de Medici, she had acquired over her mind an extraordinary ascendancy and had accompanied her to the court of France. "Poor moth," said Richelieu, "who did not know that the fire which was destined to consume her was inseparably united with the glory of that light which she followed, full of ease and content."

The authority of the regent was destroyed when a stranger—hated on the ground of being a foreigner and having besides no ability—assumed as councillor the position which had for twenty years been held by a man of superior talent—the companion of the dynasty in good and evil fortune alike. The Prince of Condé, the Count of Soissons his uncle, the Dukes of Bouillon and Guise, and a crowd of other nobles hastened to the court to secure pensions, the grant of which very soon exhausted the treasure amassed in the Bastille by Henry IV. The queen could hardly resist their demands when her favourite set the example of scandalous greed. Concini laid eager hands on the treasury; in a few months he had bought for 300,000 livres the marquisate of Ancre, near Amiens, and for other 200,000 the position of first gentleman of the chamber. He also secured by purchase the lieutenant-generalships of Peronne, Amiens, Dieppe, Pont-de-l'Arche, Quillebœuf, Bourg in Bresse, and others. He set the coping stone upon the edifice of his insolent effrontery by assuming the title of marshal without having ever been on a field of battle. Leonora, for her part, worked for the common good, by selling pardons and exemptions. When the *cour-des-aides* prosecuted fraudulent officers of finance, she engaged by contract to secure their acquittal in return for 300,000 livres.

First Revolt of the Nobles (1614).—The pretensions of the

nobles increased with the weakness of the government. "The queen's presents," says Richelieu, "assuaged the violent hunger of their avarice and ambition, but did not extinguish it. The treasury and the coffers of the Bastille were emptied, but they then aspired to things so great that royal authority could not allow them to be given the increased power which they demanded. They desired governments for themselves and their families, and places of security; in short the dismemberment of France. Épernon was Governor of Metz, but Henry IV., distrusting that proud lord, had imposed on him a lieutenant who occupied the citadel and was directly responsible to the king. On the very day of Henry's death Épernon sent orders that the lieutenant and the citadel should be seized, and he thus secured on the frontier of the Spanish dominions a strong place which he called his "kingdom of Austrasia." Many nobles, at the news of the assassination of Henry IV., had thrown themselves into towns as they willed, and some would not abandon them, saying that the days of kings had passed and that the days of the nobles had dawned. The first refusal of the regent to grant a request produced civil war. Condé took up arms and published a manifesto, in which he accused the court of having debased the nobles, ruined the finances, and grieved the people at large, singular charges in the mouth of a prince who with his friends had received the greater part of the money of the poor. The manifesto concluded, according to custom, with a demand for the summoning of the States-General to secure the remedy of abuses.

Brought up in the Catholic religion, but coming from a Protestant family, Condé hoped to rally both parties to his side. A large number of nobles ranged themselves under his standard, at their head the Dukes of Vendôme, Longueville, Luxemburg, Mayenne, Nevers, de Retz, and others. The Calvinists declined to take part in this movement. "We have," they said, "as much liberty of conscience as we can desire and we do not wish, in order to satisfy some factious persons, to leave our wives and houses." Neither were the Catholics moved. Since the States of the League there had been a great decline in popular passion. The party of the *Politiques*, founded by l'Hôpital and triumphant with Henry IV., included almost all the lawyers and bourgeoisie. The dearly-bought experience of the civil wars was not lost; the nation compared with those thirty-eight years of massacre and pillage the twelve years of prosperity which they had enjoyed; they rallied round the throne, leaving the nobles to pursue their

sterile ambition in isolation. "The people," wrote Malherbe at this time, "remained tranquil, doing nothing, for they had no means of doing anything." Had there been a firm hand at the helm even the most turbulent would have been compelled to keep the peace as they had been under the late king. Some of the former ministers of Henry IV., such as Villeroy and Jeannin, advised the regent to act with vigour, but she preferred to treat at St. Menehould (May, 1614). Condé received 450,000 livres in ready money; Mayenne 300,000 for his marriage; Longueville 100,000 as a pension; other similar grants were made. But the court, wishing to recover in one direction that which it had lost in another, did not this year pay the interest on the debt. So much was done for "the poor people."

States-General of 1614.—The princes informed the regent that if she were anxious to postpone the assembling of the States, they would readily agree. Marie de Medici feared deceit in this proposal, which would afterwards have afforded the princes excuse for a new rebellion, and the assembly was opened at Paris in October, 1614. It was the last meeting of the States-General until 1789. Among the deputies was a young man of twenty-nine, who had already gained sufficient reputation among his own order to be nominated orator for it on the day of the presentation of the portfolios. He was Armand Duplessis de Richelieu, Bishop of Lucon, deputy of the clergy.

The three orders did not agree; there were regrettable words and scenes. A member of the third estate was caned by a deputy of the nobles and could not obtain reparation. The orator of the bourgeoisie having dared to say that the French formed a single family, of which the nobles were the eldest and the third estate the younger branch, the nobles complained to the regent of his words as being an insult. "It is great insolence to attempt to establish any kind of equality between the nobles and the third estate," said the president of the nobles, Baron de Sénecé, and the noble deputies added, "Yes, for between us and them there is the same difference as between master and valet."

No better agreement existed in the wishes of the different estates. The clergy demanded the introduction into France of all the decrees of the Council of Trent, which parliament had so far rejected. The nobles, to divide the third estate, demanded the abolition of the *paulette*, which, by establishing the hereditary character of offices, had led to the creation of the nobles of the robe. On their side, the third estate wished to reduce the pensions paid to the nobles, which, having been doubled since the

time of Henry IV., now exceeded 5,500,000. It demanded also the condemnation of the ultramontane doctrine still held by some bishops, that the pope might deprive of the royal office "the sacred persons of the kings" and might release subjects from their oath of allegiance. It was not difficult for the ministers to profit from these dissensions. On the pretext that the hall was required for a ballet, the meeting-place of the States was closed (March, 1615), a remarkable parallel to 1789, when the hall was also closed. Then, however, the third estate found another meeting-place in the tennis court. In 1614 the deputies of the third estate were in advance of the nation and were thus without strength; in 1789 they had behind them 25 million men who followed and supported them.

The assembly of 1614 hardly deserves the discredit into which it has fallen. It accomplished nothing, but it showed how far the political education of the higher bourgeoisie had progressed. The speeches of the orators of this section, and more especially of its president, Robert Miron, provost of the merchants of Paris, revealed a practical knowledge of affairs and an astonishing desire for salutary reforms. In their eyes absolute monarchy was legitimate because it was still necessary; the king, as supreme legislator, should be obeyed by all, but on condition that he carried out the internal reforms which the country demanded. "If your Majesty does not take care," said Miron, "there is reason to fear that despair will inform the people that a soldier is merely a peasant who bears arms, and when the vinedresser has assumed the musket that which is to-day the anvil will become the hammer." The bourgeoisie demanded the periodic assembling of a general representation of the people at least once every ten years, freedom of municipal elections, and the guarantee and extension of municipal privileges. In the matter of finance, the third estate sought a fairer distribution of public charges among the citizens; the compulsion of clergy or gentlemen having houses in towns to contribute to municipal charges and the suppression of sinecures. In the matter of justice, they required the equality of all before the law, the enfranchisement of serfs, the abolition of exceptional tribunals, more rapid and less expensive procedure. In the matter of commerce and industry, they desired the suppression of internal customs duties, of *jurandes* and *maitrises*,[1] freedom of traffic throughout the kingdom, and the establishment of protective duties against foreign manufactured goods. They

[1] Wardenships and "a dignity which gives the quality of master."

also asked for the suppression of great military offices, the withdrawal of recent patents of nobility, the destruction of fortresses in the interior of the kingdom, the suppression of useless or excessive pensions, and the stern prohibition of duelling; the punishment, as treasonable, of all assemblies or levies of men without the king's leave, and finally regulations which should preserve the poor from the oppression of the government or of the soldiers. In the case of the Church, they requested a fairer distribution of its wealth, by the reduction of the richer benefices for the benefit of those in which the income was deficient. They further asked that bishops should be compelled to be in residence and that they should be nominated by the king from among three candidates, chosen by the bishops of the province, the chapter of the cathedral, and twenty-four notables of the diocese. They wished a mortmain law to be passed, so far as lands not immediately adjoining some religious house or church were concerned; in this case grants were to be verified by parliament. Such were the chief projects for reform put forward by the third estate, the majority of which had already been mooted in earlier assemblies and thus deserve some attention even though the effort was unavailing. In the course of centuries that which was once the dream of exalted minds becomes the idea of the many. Omitting the revolutionary States of 1356, the continual progress of the national idea may be traced from 1484 to 1614. Richelieu, Colbert, and Turgot in turn strove to satisfy these continual demands, the importance of which they understood; but the majority of ministers awaited the time when the nation itself undertook the execution of reform.

Second Rebellion of the Nobles: Treaty of Loudun (1615–1616).—The malcontents had demanded the convocation of the States-General in order to excuse their taking up arms. When they had exhausted the money which they had derived from their first rebellion, they again revolted, on the pretext that the demands of the States had not been granted. Condé on this occasion gained the support of the Protestants; the Duke of Rohan raised the population of the Cevennes and the whole party took up arms to support a factious nobility. The court was then engaged in preparations for a progress to Bordeaux, where the king was to meet his bride, Anne of Austria, and at the same time to hand over his sister to the envoys of the King of Spain. It was not possible to delay the journey as the Spaniards had already set out and an army was needed to escort the king and his sister to the frontier and to convey the Infanta to

Paris. Throughout the journey, which hardly resembled that of a sovereign, the court was constantly harassed by the soldiers of Condé and Rohan, and the queen-mother purchased a new peace at Loudun (May, 1616). Louis XIII. recognised the prince and his associates as his loyal subjects, declared that they had done nothing which was not "very agreeable" to him, and paid the troops which they had raised against him. Condé alone received 1,500,000 livres; he made a profit from every revolt and cost the state more than twenty millions.

First Ministry of Richelieu: Arrest of Condé (1616).—The king returned to Paris with Condé; the court flocked round him and he seemed for a time to be the true ruler of France. Marie de Medici, who still governed in the name of her son, was now brought face to face with a new rebellion and at last displayed some vigour. She had recently taken a new minister; the Bishop of Lucon had become Grand Almoner and then a member of the council in which he soon made his influence felt. Concini found that the young prelate knew more than all "the greybeards"; he gave him one of the four secretaryships with the control of foreign affairs. Rigorous measures were soon adopted; in September, 1616, the Prince of Condé was arrested at the Louvre and thrown into the Bastille. His partisans tried to raise Paris and the neighbouring provinces, but "heard the king speak in a more royal tone than hitherto." Richelieu loved to appeal to public opinion. "Some dissatisfied spirits," he said, in a kind of manifesto, "have troubled the peace which the prudence of the queen has established; she has tried in vain to restrain them with chains of gold, and they have abused her clemency and liberality." He went on to point out that Condé had extorted $3\frac{1}{2}$ million livres in six years, Mayenne 2 millions, Nevers 1,600,000, Longueville 1,200,000, Vendôme 600,000, Bouillon nearly a million, and that each one of them had tried to establish "a private tyranny in each province." The princes and their adherents were declared guilty of treason and deprived of their dignities; three armies were sent into Picardy, Champagne, and Berri to put down the revolt. On this occasion, the royalist cause would have triumphed had not the king joined the malcontents in order to overthrow his ministers and to free himself from tutelage.

Death of Concini (1617).—Concini was inspired merely by vulgar ambition. He loved wealth; power frightened him since he felt that he had not the capacity for wielding it. Having neither devotion nor a sense of his obligation towards the queen,

he would have left France if his wife had not refused to consent to such an exhibition of "ingratitude and cowardice." He hoped that with his eight million livres he could buy the duchy of Ferrara from the pope, and that, having left Florence without a penny, he might return there as a prince and be delivered from the general outcry of the French nation who disliked him because of his foreign blood. He knew that he was both hated and in danger; the mob had once already sacked his house in Paris, and it was not from this direction alone that he had reason to anticipate peril. Louis XIII. was now sixteen. His character was sad and morose; he lived in isolation, excluded from affairs by his mother and Concini, surrounded only by a few pages to whom he was attached because his nature demanded affection. He was filled with friendship for a young country gentleman employed to look after his hawks. Albert de Luynes was the son of an officer of fortune and was already thirty-eight. As the king's favourite, he formed the hope of displacing the queen-mother's favourite; a secret plot was formed by Louis, his falconer, and his gardener; Vitry, the captain of the guard, received orders to arrest Concini and to kill him if he resisted. "On April 24, the Sieur de Vitry, accompanied by twenty-five gentlemen who appeared to be following him accidentally, accosted Marshal d'Ancre as he was entering the Louvre and was still on the bridge, and informed him that he was arrested by command of the king. Immediately afterwards, d'Ancre having said nothing but, 'I, a prisoner?' they fired three pistol shots at him and he fell dead. One of his followers drew his sword, but a shout was raised that it was the king's will, and Concini's friend gave way. At the same time, the king appeared at a window, and the Louvre re-echoed with the cry, 'Vive le roi!'"

Leonora Galigaï suffered a sadder fate. She was accused of peculation, of plotting against the state, and of sorcery. It was asked, according to the story, by what magical arts she had acquired an ascendancy over the mind of the queen. "By the power of a strong nature over a feeble one," she replied. She was executed on the Place de Grève and her remains were burned. Marie de Medici was ordered to leave the court and retired to Blois; Richelieu went into exile in his bishopric (1617).

Government of Albert de Luynes (1617–1621): New Rebellions.—The nobles applauded the overthrow of Concini, from which they hoped to profit. But when they saw that Luynes appropriated the spoils of the marshal, becoming in less than fifteen months a duke, a peer, and Governor of Picardy,

marrying a Rohan, who later became the too notorious Duchess of Chevreuse, and making one of his brothers Duke of Chaulnes and another Duke of Piney-Luxemburg, they again took up arms, though under a new standard. They allied with the queen-mother, to whom they had before been consistently opposed. Épernon, at the head of three hundred gentlemen, freed her from her prison at Blois and tried with her aid to raise the south. Luynes was as unable as Concini had been to resist them. The Peace of Angoulême, negotiated by Richelieu, gave Marie de Medici the government of Anjou and three cautionary towns (1619). Angers soon became the seat of new intrigues and the resort of all the disaffected; the queen-mother attempted to regain her power. But the king played at being a soldier. When his troops had been assembled in camp, he found in their midst the warlike spirit of his father. He advanced on Angers, decided to pursue his mother into Poitou, and then to Guienne, if she fled there for refuge, "throwing away his scabbard on the banks of the Loire." He had no need to pursue her so far, as her partisans were defeated in a bloody skirmish near the bridges of Cé, and the route to the south being thus cut, she was glad to demand by Richelieu a renewal of the earlier treaty (1620).

Republican Organisation of the Protestants.—At this time a more formidable disturbance broke out in the south in the shape of a religious war. Marie de Medici and Louis XIII., on attaining his majority, had followed the policy of Henry IV. with regard to the Protestants, "declaring themselves to be persuaded by experience that violence served only to increase the number of those who abandoned the Church, in place of indicating to them the way of returning to it." But the reformers themselves went beyond the terms of the Edict of Nantes. When they saw the queen-mother ally with Spain, they began to defy her authority, and at the assembly of Saumur, in 1611, they adopted a veritable republican organisation. From their 806 churches they formed sixteen provinces, which were subdivided into districts. A consistory, meeting once a week, governed the Church; a colloquy, which assembled once every three months, governed the district; an annual synod dealt with the affairs of the province, while once every three years a national synod was to meet under an elective president. For purposes of policy and war the provinces were grouped in circles, as in Germany; each circle, as well as each province, had its council, which could at need convoke a general assembly. Finally, two mandatories, elected for three years, resided at the court and served as intermediaries

between the Protestant party and the king. Everything was done by means of election and of representatives. Thus a democratic republic was formed in the heart of the absolute monarchy. The general assemblies hoped that they would acquire the same rights and play the same rôle as the States-General in Holland. These pretensions alarmed the court, and some Catholics took offence. In certain towns, old animosities once more appeared, recalling the worst days of the League, though the mob no longer murdered the reformers, contenting itself with destroying their churches, desecrating their graveyards, and forcing their ministers to take to flight.

War with the Protestants: Death of Albert de Luynes (1621).—In 1617 an edict re-established the Catholic religion in Béarn, ordering the Protestants to restore the ecclesiastical property which they had secularised in the last half-century. The Protestants refused, and eventually the king, entering the province with an army, compelled the execution of the edict. The whole Huguenot party was disturbed, despite the counsels of Sully and Duplessis-Mornay; a general assembly, held at La Rochelle, published a declaration of independence, raised troops, and, after receiving a refusal from the aged Marshal Lesdiguières and from the Duke of Bouillon, gave the command to the Duke of Rohan (1621). De Luynes, whom Louis XIII. at once appointed constable, advanced against Montauban with 15,000 men, being accompanied by the king and an unfrocked Carmelite who was said to have prophesied the victory of the Austrians before Prague in the previous year. He now promised that Montauban would infallibly capitulate on a certain date, though it was first needful to make use of the weapons of worldly prudence and to fire 400 rounds into the place. They were gravely fired, and several more rounds also. The heretical walls resisted. A regular siege was formed, but the town, despite a famine, made a heroic resistance. The attack, which began on August 8, had made no perceptible progress by November 2, and Rohan was at hand with an army of relief. It was necessary to raise the siege, and the royalist army consoled itself with the capture of the small town of Monheurt on the Garonne. There the constable contracted a fever, of which he died (December, 1621). "This eminent and powerful man," says a contemporary, "found himself so deserted during his illness that, in the course of two days in which he was in agony, hardly one of his men would remain in his chamber. When his body was brought out to be buried at his château of Luynes, in place of priests to pray

for his soul I saw two of his valets playing piquet while they were waiting for their horses."

Louis XIII. continued the war alone, and in the following year conducted a vigorous campaign, sacking the places which he took and ordering severe punishments in them. Rohan profited by a slight intermission during the siege of Montpellier to secure a peace, by which the Edict of Nantes was renewed, but by which political assemblies were prohibited, and no strong places left to the Protestants except La Rochelle and Montauban. (October, 1622.)

Universal Disorder in the State.—Luynes left the country in a condition of weakness and disorder which recalled the worst days of French history. The authority of the crown was humiliated by constant revolts, the nobles dictated laws to their sovereign and were masters of the provinces which they governed, the Calvinists were ready to separate from the body of the nation. Abroad, the old policy of Francis I. and Henry IV. was abandoned; the kingdom had neither allies nor prestige; the house of Austria had inaugurated the Thirty Years' War by a series of victories which seemed to be the prelude of the ruin of German Protestantism and of the consequent enslavement of Europe. At such a time, Richelieu took charge of affairs.

Ministry of Richelieu (1624–1642): His Projects.—After the death of Luynes, Marie de Medici was reconciled with her son and obtained a cardinal's hat for her habitual adviser, the Bishop of Lucon. At the beginning of 1624 she secured his admission to the council. At the end of some months, Richelieu, having secured the ascendancy over or displaced the other ministers, and having expelled a new favourite, completed the subjugation of Louis XIII. to the guidance of his superior genius, and laid down the lines of that policy which was destined to render illustrious a reign which had opened so inauspiciously.

Richelieu has himself left on record the whole scheme of his policy. "When your Majesty," he said to Louis XIII., "decided to accord to me at once a place in your council and a great share of your confidence, I may say with truth that the Huguenots shared the authority over the state with you, that the nobles behaved as if they were no longer subjects, and that the more powerful governors of provinces acted as though they were sovereigns in the districts, the control of which had been entrusted to them. I may add that our foreign relations rested on a false basis. I promised your Majesty that I would employ all my industry and all the authority which it may please you

to give me, to effect the destruction of the Huguenot faction, to reduce the pride of the nobles, and to raise the prestige of France among the foreign nations to that point at which it ought to be." To this work he brought a great intellect and a degree of skill which enabled him to grasp with equal ability the general and the particular aspects of every question, an activity which never wearied, and a will of iron. As he remarked, "It has been my habit to reflect long before taking any decision, but when I have decided on my course, I proceed directly to my goal."

First Acts of Richelieu: New War against the Protestants (1625–1626).—Richelieu had three aims which he pursued simultaneously. On his entry into the council, he concluded, cardinal though he was, a marriage between a sister of Louis XIII., Henrietta Maria, and Charles I., King of England; he signed a new alliance with the Dutch, secretly supplied money to Mansfeld, who at that moment was alone resisting the progress of Austrian arms in Germany; and he sent 10,000 men to expel the soldiers of the pope from the Valtelline in order to restore that district to Grisons. All these alliances were with Protestants. Spain, threatened by his policy, had hardly any soldiers, but she still possessed gold, and some money which she expended judiciously among the Huguenots produced a new rising. Richelieu realised that it was impossible for the present to play a decisive part in foreign affairs; he adjourned the prosecution of less urgent designs in order to deal with the Protestants at home. While the Duke of Rohan rallied to him those of Languedoc and the Cevennes, his brother, Soubise, armed the Rochellois. La Rochelle was then a veritable republic, the centre and the capital of Calvinism; its fleet was superior to that of the King of France, and Richelieu, surprised by this revolt which he was not prepared to meet, was forced to borrow ships from two Protestant states, England and Holland. He had the address to obtain them by promising on his part the support of France against the house of Austria. His admiral, the Duke of Montmorency, gained some successes on the coasts of Aunis and Poitou, and Soubise took refuge in England with the remainder of his fleet. Richelieu then offered peace to the rebels, in order that he might at leisure prepare means for destroying them later; he permitted the courtiers to denounce him to Catholic France as "the Pope of the Huguenots and the patriarch of atheists" (February, 1626).

Destruction of the Huguenots (1627): Capture of La Rochelle

(1628) and the Edict of Alais (1629).—Meanwhile he introduced a measure of order into the finances, organised an army, constructed or purchased vessels, and signed with Spain the Treaty of Moncon, which left him the free disposition of all his forces. When all was ready, he took with him the king and the nobles to the siege of La Rochelle, being resolved, as Malherbe puts it, in one of his best odes,

> "Donner le dernier coup à la dernière tête
> De la rébellion."

The undertaking, which was very popular in France, appeared to be difficult, since Charles I. of England sent the Calvinists a fleet of ninety ships, commanded by the handsome and incapable Buckingham. The generals and courtiers, "who desired only great successes that should come post haste," showed a degree of ill-will, which found expression even in the remarks of the brave and loyal Bassompierre. But Richelieu provided for every eventuality; he was at once general, engineer, and admiral. Seconded by Sourdis, Bishop of Maillezais, whom he had appointed to command his squadron, and who later became Archbishop of Bordeaux, he expelled the English from the island of Ré, where they had established themselves, and to prevent them from revictualling La Rochelle, closed the approaches to the port by a vast breakwater which was not covered even by the highest tides. Its ends were guarded by two forts, while 200 vessels were placed on the neighbouring shores and by the mole to defend it. The English tried in vain to force their way in; two further fleets came from England and were repulsed, and La Rochelle was cut off from the Atlantic. On the land side, three lines of circumvallation, protected by thirteen forts, flanked by redoubts, and well furnished with artillery, surrounded the city. It resisted none the less, sustained by the virile courage of the Duchess of Rohan, who was shut up within the city, and by the energy of Guiton, its mayor, who threatened to stab any one who spoke of surrender, demanding that he should be so treated if he ever proposed to capitulate. But the defenders were decimated by hunger and by the attacks made upon the city. "Soon the city will have no inhabitants," some one said to the mayor. "It will be enough if there is one left to open the gates," he answered. The place at last surrendered when no further food could be found. It had held the fortune of Richelieu in check for fifteen months; its conquest had cost the king 40 millions, but the price was not too high

since it enabled the cardinal to achieve the political unity of France (October 29, 1628).

La Rochelle was treated as a conquered place; its municipal franchises were suppressed, its mayoralty abolished, its fortifications razed. Montauban and the other revolted towns successively made their submission. The Duke of Rohan held out for eight months longer, thanks to the affairs of Italy which summoned Richelieu across the Alps. The Peace of Alais, or *Edict of Grace*, of June, 1629, at last closed the final religious war. The English, who had supported the Huguenots, recognised by the Treaty of St. Germain the French possession of Acadia and Cape Breton Island (1632). From this time, the Calvinists ceased to be a political party and to form a state within the state. Richelieu left them freedom of worship and the benefit of civil equality. Throughout his ministry he employed them, like other citizens, in the army, magistracy, and financial offices; he encouraged them to devote themselves to agriculture, commerce, and industry, protected them in their goods and persons, and afforded a remarkable example of moderation at a time when no one in Europe, Catholic or Protestant, understood true toleration. In 1630 an unfortunate man was executed at Geneva as a perjurer and blasphemer; he had become a Jew.

Repression of the Nobles: Chalais (1626): Day of the Dupes (1630): Execution of Montmorency (1632): The Count of Soissons (1641): Cinq-Mars (1642).—Richelieu desired the monarchy to be the supreme maintainer of public order, having, as he said on his deathbed, neither love not hate for any man, but executing stern justice towards all. His contest with the nobles, which began in the first days of his ministry, continued till his death. Intrigues, conspiracies, and rebellions constantly imperilled his life and authority, the authority of the king, and the repose of France. He repressed all such attempts against him with merciless severity. "It is iniquitous," he said to the king, "to make an example of the weak, who are trees which afford no shade, and as it is right to treat with consideration those nobles who are loyal, so it is equally needful to hold them under the curb of discipline." But if the cardinal was right in punishing the guilty, it may be regretted that his methods were so rigorous, especially as, like Louis XI., he appeared on occasion to give justice the character of revenge and to make the scaffold an instrument of government.

The earlier conspirators were young nobles, advisers or friends of Gaston of Orleans, the king's brother. Richelieu was

interested to convert foolish outbursts into crimes, yet it is possible that there was no calumny in his assertion that his opponents had formed a design to murder him, to depose Louis, to place Gaston on the throne, and to marry him to Anne of Austria. The young prince's tutor, d'Ornano, whom Richelieu had made a marshal without winning his support; the Duchess of Chevreuse, the queen's friend; the Count of Soissons, the Princes of Vendôme, sons of Henry IV., the Count of Chalais, and others were in the plot. It was discovered; the Duchess of Chevreuse was banished from the court with the Vendômes; d'Ornano was imprisoned in the Bastille, where he died "not without suspicion of violence"; Chalais was executed at Nantes by an executioner so incapable that thirty-four blows of the axe were required to remove his head, at the twentieth of which the wretched man was still groaning. Even the queen was called in question. Louis read to her, in the presence of the cardinal, the depositions which charged her with wishing to marry Gaston, to which she answered with disdain that she would gain nothing by such a change of husbands. Gaston was, in fact, a feeble prince; he humbled himself before Richelieu, and promised "to love and to bear affection towards those who loved the king and the queen-mother."

In the following year (1627), a terrible lesson was given to those who inclined to imagine that they were above the law. The Counts of Bouteville and Chapelles were beheaded on the Place de Grève as the result of a duel. Bouteville was engaged in his twenty-second affair; he had returned hastily from the Low Countries, and had fought by daylight in the midst of the Place Royale, the better to illustrate his contempt for the king and his edicts. On this occasion, the fight had at least been honourable; it was not always so, many so-called duels were in reality assassinations. Thus, the Chevalier de Guise met the aged Baron de Luz in his carriage, forced him to get out, and ran him through with his sword as he tried to take refuge in a neighbouring house. The baron's son challenged the chevalier; Guise killed him also, and for this brave deed became the hero of the court. This was before the time of Richelieu, who was resolved to make an end of such exploits. It was estimated that in the eighteen years prior to 1609, 4000 gentlemen had fallen in single combat; after the death of Richelieu duelling revived so that 940 gentlemen were killed in these fights between 1643 and 1654.

By repressing the plot of Chalais, Richelieu had overcome by

one blow the king's wife and his brother; in 1630 the turn of the queen-mother came. Marie de Medici had secured entry into the council for the cardinal, whom she believed that she could use. When she found that the minister was concerned only with the great affairs of state, that he resisted her caprices and those of Gaston, her second and favourite son, she resolved to destroy her ungrateful servant, and by means of prayers and tears she wrung from Louis, who was then ill, a promise that Richelieu should be disgraced. Richelieu prepared to retire. The court was already thronging the antechamber of the queen-mother at the Luxemburg, when St. Simon, a straightforward man, father of the well-known memoir-writer, indicated to the king the precipice "to which the humours of the queen-mother were dragging him and the number of men who all aspired to govern in her name." On the advice of St. Simon, the cardinal hastened to Versailles. "Serve me as you have served me so far and I will maintain you against all those who have sworn to destroy you," said Louis. Marie de Medici had already received the congratulations of the court, and was only informed of the truth when she found herself deserted. Such was the Day of the Dupes (1630).

It involved the destruction of some of the cardinal's enemies. Two brothers, Marillac, the first of whom was a vice-chancellor, the second a marshal of France, had too hastily joined in the triumph of the queen-mother. The first was removed and died in prison; the other was arrested in the midst of his army in Piedmont, accused of extortion, and tried by an extraordinary tribunal in Richelieu's own house at Rueil. He was condemned to death and executed in 1632. His friend Bassompierre was imprisoned in the Bastille, where he remained twelve years until the cardinal's death. Marie de Medici was relegated to Compiègne; when she saw that she could expect no more advantage from her son she fled to Brussels where she resided under the equivocal protection of the Spaniards in a condition bordering on misery. Richelieu had taken care not to prevent her flight.

Gaston, the frivolous and incapable Duke of Orleans, second son of Marie de Medici, had also left France, issuing a furious manifesto against her and the cardinal. Having taken refuge with Charles IV., Duke of Lorraine, a prince devoted to Austria, Gaston married his sister despite the king's prohibition and settled in the Low Countries near his mother. He maintained relations with the malcontents in France and formed a new

conspiracy which resulted in open rebellion. The Governor of Languedoc, the illustrious and imprudent Montmorency, allowed himself to be beguiled by the promises of Gaston. While the prince entered the kingdom with some thousand adventurers, he raised the provinces of the south, which Richelieu had angered by attempting to introduce royal officials into the internal administration of these *pays d'états*. When they had united their forces, the rebels gave battle to the royal army commanded by Marshal Schomberg under the walls of Castelnaudary (September, 1632). The Duke of Orleans fled at the first onslaught, "Throwing his arms on the ground and saying that he would play no more"; Montmorency, left alone, was taken, condemned by the parliament of Toulouse, and executed, despite the petitions of all the nobles in his favour. "Many," said Richelieu, "murmured at this action and held it to be an excess of severity; others, who were wiser, praised the justice of the king who preferred the welfare of the state to a vain reputation for dangerous clemency; and they admired the courage of the cardinal who disregarded his own safety and the hatred of all the nobles in order that he might render faithful service to the king."

The Duke of Lorraine paid for this war. Louis in person took Bar-le-Duc and effected the military occupation of the duchy, which remained in the hands of France until the close of the century. Gaston was spared because he was of the blood royal of France, "which must be respected." But he was ordered to retire to Blois. Four years later a happy event deprived him of the position of heir-presumptive to the crown, Anne of Austria giving birth to a son, afterwards Louis XIV. (September 5, 1638).

The humiliation inflicted upon the Duke of Épernon, the last exponent of feudal pretensions, and the condemnation to death of the Duke of La Valette for a military mistake, indicated that a new era had dawned, that of absolute obedience. But the Count of Soissons, chief of a branch of the family of Condé, tried yet again to overthrow the terrible cardinal. Having taken refuge at Sedan with the Duke of Bouillon he called to him all the malcontents in order to revive civil war in France. Spain hastened to supply him with 7000 men. Marshal Châtillon watched Sedan with a royal army; he was surprised in the wood of La Marfée some leagues from the town, and defeated by the desertion of part of his forces. But the Count of Soissons fell during the pursuit, killed by a chance pistol shot, and the war

ended with him, the Duke of Bouillon hastening to make his submission to the king (July, 1641).

The final conspiracy was that of Cinq-Mars. He was a son of the Marquis of Effiat, and had been placed by Richelieu with the king, to amuse him, distract him, and watch him. Having soon become a necessary favourite, he was made grand equerry and dreamed of emulating the fortune of the Constable de Luynes, who had risen from a similar position. He had half entered into the plot of the Count of Soissons ; when that prince was dead, he plotted on his own account. He flattered himself that he could overthrow Richelieu with the help of the nobles and perhaps with the complicity of the king, who seemed to be weary of his minister. If the king did not enter the plot, the queen and Gaston did, and the Duke of Bouillon had promised that if the king died he would receive the queen and her two sons at Sedan to free them from the power of the cardinal. Cinq-Mars ruined himself by signing a treaty of alliance with the Spaniards. Richelieu, who was then ill and almost dying, bought a copy of the treaty and sent it to Louis. Cinq-Mars, according to custom, was handed over to an extraordinary tribunal, condemned, and beheaded at Lyons (September, 1642). He was less than twenty-two years old. With him perished de Thou, the son of the historian, who paid with his head for his desire to live in the midst of the nobles and of their intrigues ; he had been the intermediary between the queen and the Duke of Bouillon. That prince only escaped by sacrificing his principality, Sedan being united to France.

Submission of the Parliament: Assemblies of Notables: Consolidation of Royal Authority.—The magistracy did not conspire, but it sometimes interfered in affairs. In 1617 Richelieu, then in exile, wrote, "The parliament owes entire obedience to the will of the king, but that will should be reasonable." When he changed his position, he altered his opinion also. In the midst of the Thirty Years' War the magistrates inclined to refuse the registration of new taxes ; Louis held a *lit-de-justice*[1] and gave expression to exalted views of his prerogative. In vain did the Advocate-General Omer Talon beg the king to be moved by prayers, "as God is moved, whose image on earth you are." He was compelled to obey, "Upon no further ground than that the sceptre was in the hands of the sovereign." Parliament was

[1] Literally the throne on which the king sat in the parliament of Paris, it came to imply a writ issued by the government and passed in solemn assembly.

expressly forbidden to remonstrate concerning edicts touching the government and administration of the state. Such remonstrance was allowed only in the case of financial edicts, on the undertaking that, notwithstanding any remonstrances, "they should be at once registered if the king decided that they ought to be."

Richelieu did not despise public opinion. Like all strong men, he made constant appeal to it, and found that it was good; but he preferred to announce what he had done than to discuss what he proposed to do. Thus he published many manifestoes, explanations of his conduct, but he did not call a States-General. He summoned only infrequent Assemblies of Notables, nominated by the king and thus having a less independent spirit and perhaps more knowledge. Such an assembly was held in 1625 to consider the affair of the Valtelline and the rupture with the pope; another was held at the end of 1626. To this no prince or duke was summoned, but magistrates, ecclesiastics, councillors of state, and the provost of the merchants of Paris. To them the minister unfolded his plan for creating a marine which should protect external commerce; for instituting a permanent army in which all ranks should be open to all; for reorganising the finances to the relief of the labouring class; for encouraging commerce and industry by attracting into them the higher bourgeoisie and the nobles; and finally for reforming internal administration.

Destruction of Feudal Fortresses: Abolition of Great Military Offices: The "Grands Jours."—As early as 1628 Richelieu had ordered the demolition of feudal fortresses which did not serve for the defence of the frontiers, and which were a standing menace to the monarchy, a source of terror to the towns and rural districts, a reminder to the nobles of their ancient power, and a constant incitement to revolt. In the same year the posts of grand admiral and constable were abolished, since they gave their holders an almost regal authority over the fleet and army. There were too many masters, Richelieu wished to reign alone.

The acquisitions of France in Lorraine were far from the seat of central authority, and Richelieu resolved to make them feel the power of government. He created the parliament of Metz and in order to make justice more expeditious he also renewed the institution of the *grands jours*. At that of Poitiers in 1634 more than 200 nobles were condemned for exactions and crimes of violence.

Creation of the Intendants.—A revolution was effected in provincial administration by the institution of the *intendants*.

Under the later Valois, the governors, who were all of the higher nobility, had rendered themselves almost independent in their provinces, and regarded their positions as hereditary. Henry IV. had been forced to purchase their obedience. Richelieu, who in every way imitated and continued and extended the work of the first Bourbon, created superior officials to take charge of justice, police, and finance, who were given the modest title of *intendants*. They were selected by the king, were without personal credit, and were under the entire control of the minister (1635). These officials, humble agents of the central power, jealously supervised the nobles, the local parliaments, and the provincial states; by degrees they concentrated all civil power in their own hands, and ultimately left to the governors nothing except the right to command the armed forces of the district and to represent it formally. Royal authority gained by this institution, to which the modern French prefects may be traced, and with royal authority national unity gained also. Since the creation of a permanent army under Charles VII. no measure had struck a heavier blow at the new feudalism.

Beginning of Naval Organisation (1631).—One of the results of the siege of La Rochelle was the first attempt to organise a navy. After each expedition the vessels employed by the state returned to some port where they remained in charge of their captains, who did not take care of them. Ships deteriorated; time was wasted in repairing them and in collecting them when a crisis arose. In 1629 Richelieu ordered d'Infreville to visit all the Atlantic ports and to select the sites for three bases; Le Havre, Brest, and Brouage were selected. Arsenals were constructed in these places, and in 1631 three commissioners-general of the marine were appointed. D'Infreville made a mistake in selecting Le Havre and Brouage; his choice of Brest was justified, as was his recommendation of Duquesne to Richelieu. Numerous vessels were prepared, and during the Thirty Years' War the French fleet dominated the Atlantic and the Mediterranean.

Disorder of the Finances.—In the matter of finance Richelieu returned to the faulty methods which Sully had abandoned. He increased the taxes; that was inevitable since he was engaged in an active policy, but he managed them badly. The difference between the revenue paid into the treasury and the revenue exacted from the people became enormous, being in 1643 33 millions against 80 millions. At the same time expenditure amounted to 89 millions and the deficit to 56 millions, apart from

the fact that the revenue was spent three years in advance. The treasury was short of money; the people were grossly pillaged. Riots took place in Paris and in the provinces. The *croquants* [1] of Guienne and the *va-nu-pieds* [2] of Normandy murdered the agents of the treasury, but troops put down these risings with severity, and both the utter disorder of the finances and the terrible misery of the rural districts were too common for either to create much concern.

Richelieu organised consulships and favoured external commerce, but imposed upon Canada those strict regulations which eventually lost it to France. He encouraged the nascent industries of glass and carpet-making, and introduced engineers from the Low Countries to drain marshes, thus continuing the work of Henry IV. and anticipating Colbert.

Foreign Policy: Struggle against the Spanish Branch of the House of Austria.—From the time of the Treaty of Vervins, France had not been engaged in any serious war. As the masses of the people were little devoted to industry and commerce and the nobles wholly indifferent to them, a new generation arose which, moved by the stories of the days of bold independence, adventure, and battle, felt an impatience of repose, a need of action which for want of leadership turned constantly to sterile agitation. From 1610 to 1624 France lacked a man; after that date she found him, a man who, after curbing these errant moods, and uniting the divided energies of his country, pointed to the French people an end worthy of great efforts, an end which he pursued with firm resolve.

"France," said Richelieu, "should reach the limits of ancient Gaul." But the Spaniards, masters of the Low Countries, Franche-Comté, and Roussillon, still enveloped the restricted France on three sides and held Italy by Naples and Milan. Richelieu was obliged to begin his work by dealing with Spain. In the first days of his ministry he renewed the old treaties concluded by Henry IV. with Venice, Savoy, and Holland (doubling the subsidies to the last), and with James I. of England, the timid successor of the great Elizabeth. When he had succeeded in breaking off the projected marriage between Charles and a Spanish Infanta he secured the young prince for Henrietta Maria, sister of Louis XIII.

War of the Valtelline (1624).—Richelieu added acts to negotiations. He expelled the Spaniards from the Valtelline, a small valley formed by the upper course of the Adda and establishing

[1] Insignificant wretches. [2] Humble peasants.

a means of communication between the Spanish Milanese and the Austrian Tyrol. The inhabitants, subjects of the Protestant canton of Grisons, were Catholics; they had revolted at the instigation of the court of Madrid, which had built several forts in the district in order ostensibly to support them against the heretics (1620). Grisons demanded the restoration of the district and the pope was selected as mediator. He hesitated for some time, but was about to decide for the Spaniards when Richelieu entered on the scene. He wrote to the French ambassador at Rome, "The king no longer wishes to be amused; he has changed his ministry and with it the maxims of his policy; he will send an army into the Valtelline which may, perhaps, serve to render the pope less uncertain and the Spaniards more tractable." The Marquis de Cœuvres arrived through Switzerland with 10,000 men and restored the Valtelline to the Grisons (1624). The court of Madrid submitted in silence to this affront, and accepted the inevitable by the Treaty of Moncon in Aragon (March, 1626).

War of the Mantuan Succession (1629).—Some years later the cardinal intervened in Italy on behalf of a French prince, Charles de Gonzaga, Duke of Nevers, who was heir to Mantua and Montferrat. The Spaniards supported the Duke of Guastella in Mantua, and Victor Amadeus, Duke of Savoy, in Montferrat, in opposition to him. They invested Casal, the capital of Montferrat. Richelieu himself crossed the Alps with an army of 36,000 men, and Louis XIII. forced the pass of Susa by a brilliant action in which he showed his father's bravery. The Duke of Savoy, having seen the courage of the attacking force and having been on the point of being taken, retired across his line, crying, "Gentlemen, let me pass, for these people are angry." He hastened to sign the Treaty of Susa; the Spaniards raised the siege of Casal and retired into the Milanese. But no great confidence could be placed in the Duke of Savoy. "His spirit was restless and wandered every day three times round the world, seeking how it might involve all the kings in war, in order to draw profit from their divisions." Before the year was ended the imperialists, victorious in Germany, invaded the Grisons, the Spaniards invaded Montferrat; the Duke of Savoy negotiated with every one. Richelieu recrossed the Alps with 40,000 men, conquered Savoy, overran Piedmont, and took Pignerolo (March, 1629). The Peace of Cherasco, negotiated by Mazarin, confirmed French influence in Italy. The Duke of Mantua was restored to his lands, and Victor Amadeus ceded Pignerolo to Louis XIII. with the pass over the Alps (April, 1631).

Thus in 1631 Richelieu had divided the dominions of the two branches of the house of Austria in Italy and opened the peninsula to France, without committing her to adventures across the Alps. He soon entered upon war with his divided foes.

The Thirty Years' War: Relations of Richelieu with Gustavus Adolphus.—The Thirty Years' War was then in full progress. That conflict, which was at once a political and a religious struggle, had begun in Bohemia (1618) and had gradually extended over the whole empire. The Elector Palatine and the King of Denmark had been in turn vanquished and humbled. The imperial army, created and commanded by Wallenstein, had penetrated as far as the Baltic, crushing under foot in its passage Germany and German liberties. The problem which had long agitated that land, whether it should be divided among many princes or united under a single head, seemed to be on the point of solution in favour of unity under the despotic rule of the Austrian house. Cardinal though he was, Richelieu therefore imitated Francis I., Henry II., and Henry IV.; he adopted the cause of the German Protestants without regard for the religion of the princes. His emissary, Father Joseph, laboured so successfully with the electors of the diet of Ratisbon that they compelled the emperor to dismiss Wallenstein and to disband his army. They refused to grant the title of King of the Romans to the emperor's son, a favour which Ferdinand II. had regarded as the tacit price for his concessions. "A poor Capuchin," he wrote in anger, "has put in his pouch six electoral bonnets."

Having thus disarmed the emperor, Richelieu next sought to bring against him an enemy from the north. Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden, had ascended the throne in 1611 at the age of seventeen and had already won himself a reputation by humiliating the Danes and Russians and by conducting a successful war with Poland. Richelieu arranged a treaty between the young hero and the Poles and then endeavoured to hurl him upon Germany by according him an annual subsidy of 1,200,000 francs, by holding before his eyes the prospect of vast spoils, the danger of his co-religionists, and the great rôle which he might play. Gustavus agreed to the Treaty of Berwald in January, 1631, but he was far from becoming the mere agent of France that the cardinal had hoped to make him. His policy was Swedish and independent, and before his death his success had become a source rather of alarm than of congratulation to Richelieu.

Gustavus appeared in the empire like a thunderbolt. He had

invented a new form of tactics which disconcerted his opponents; he defeated Tilly near Leipzig, killed him at the passage of the Lech, and died himself at the Battle of Lutzen in the hour of victory. His death was opportune for France. Richelieu was now free from internal embarrassments and could turn his undivided attention to foreign affairs. In the struggle against the house of Austria, France, full of youthful energy, took the place of a weakened and defeated Denmark, a Sweden widowed of her king.

First Period of French Intervention (1635–1643): Alliances and Strength of France.—Against the two branches of the house of Austria, which were closely united, Richelieu formed a solid ring of alliances. By the Convention of Paris he promised 12,000 men to the German confederates, who handed Alsace over to him (November, 1634); by that of St. Germain he hired Bernhard of Saxe-Weimar, the best pupil of Gustavus, and his army (October, 1635). At Compiègne he concluded a treaty with another great minister, the Swedish chancellor, Oxenstierna (April, 1635); at Wesel with the Landgraf of Hesse-Cassel, who supplied troops in return for a subsidy (October, 1636); at Paris with the Dutch for the partition of the Low Countries (February, 1637); at Rivoli with the Swiss and the Dukes of Savoy, Mantua, and Parma (July, 1637).

These numerous treaties indicated the approaching extension of the war. Richelieu carried it on in every direction. He fought on the side of the Low Countries to divide them with Holland; on the Rhine to protect Champagne and Lorraine and to acquire Alsace; in Italy to maintain the authority of the Grisons in the Valtelline and the influence of France in Piedmont; towards the Pyrenees for the conquest of Roussillon; on the Atlantic and Mediterranean in order to destroy the Spanish fleets, support the revolt of Portugal and of Catalonia, and threaten the shores of Italy. With a just pride he made known what prodigious efforts he demanded from the nation for seven years, without mentioning the armies of Roussillon and Catalonia. "Posterity," he told the king, "will hardly believe that in this war the realm has been able to maintain seven armies on land and two fleets, without counting those of the allies, to the support of which we have contributed not a little. Yet it is true that, over and above the powerful army of 20,000 infantry and 6000 or 7000 cavalry which you have always had in Picardy to attack your enemies, you have had in the same province another force of 10,000 infantry and 4000 cavalry to prevent the crossing

of that frontier. It is further true that you have always had an army of the same strength in Champagne; another of equal strength in Burgundy; another as powerful in Germany; another equally formidable in Italy; and for some time, yet another in the Valtelline. Though your predecessors despised the sea so much that the great king, your father, had not a single ship, you have never failed during the whole of this war to maintain on the Mediterranean twenty galleys and twenty ships, as well as sixty well-equipped in the Atlantic. You have further assisted the Dutch every year with 1,200,000 livres and sometimes more; the Duke of Savoy with over 1,000,000; the crown of Sweden with a like sum; the Landgraf of Hesse with 200,000 rix-thalers; and various other princes with other sums as need has arisen."

Victories of the Dukes of Saxe-Weimar, of D'Harcourt, of Guébriant, and of Sourdis.—The pretext for rupture was found in the seizure by the Spaniards of the archbishopric of Treves, which had placed itself under the protection of France. The war began successfully. Châtillon and Brézé won the victory of Avein in the Low Countries near Liége (May, 1635). But the Dutch were alarmed at seeing the French so near them; they preferred a weak Spain to a rejuvenated France for a neighbour and they gave little assistance. The Spaniards profited from this misunderstanding; reinforced by 18,000 imperialists under Piccolomini, they invaded Picardy while the French army was still in Holland, crossed the Somme, and took Corbie (1636). For a moment Paris and its court trembled; but the city soon regained its courage. The artisans and the mass of the people enlisted in crowds; the bourgeoisie gave the king means to levy and to maintain for three months 12,000 infantry and 3000 cavalry. Louis XIII., bolder on this occasion than Richelieu, refused to retire behind the Loire; at the head of 40,000 men he advanced to repulse the Spaniards and retook Corbie. There the cardinal escaped the greatest peril into which he ever ran, since Gaston's heart failed him at the very moment when he was to give the sign for the minister's assassination (1636). Another invasion attempted in Burgundy also failed. Gallas and the Duke of Lorraine advanced at the head of 30,000 men as far as Dijon, and in order to assure a passage over the Saône during the winter attacked St. Jean de Losne. The citizens made a brave defence; they were aided by a rise in the river. Count de Rantzau forced the imperialists to retreat and the Duke of Saxe-Weimar repulsed them in disorder in Franche-Comté.

In the following year the Cardinal de la Vallette took the towns on the upper Sambre, Cateau-Cambrésis, Landrecies, and Maubeuge. Richelieu liked to entrust commands to priests, who were accustomed to obey. His admiral was generally Sourdis, Archbishop of Bordeaux, who in 1638 destroyed a Spanish fleet at Fuentarabia and more than once ravaged the coasts of Naples and Spain. But the chief success of this year was on the Rhine, where Bernhard of Saxe-Weimar beat the imperialists at Rheinfeld, captured their general, John von Werth, and carried Alt-Breisach by assault after three victories. He aspired to make himself sovereign of Alsace and of Breisgau, when he died in 1639, opportunely for France, which inherited his conquests and his army.

Alsace was an Austrian province. Artois, which belonged to Spain, was invaded in the following year. Three marshals, La Meilleraye, Châtillon, and Chaulnes, besieged Arras, and an army of 30,000 men under Beck and Lamboi advanced to its relief. The marshals could not agree; one wished to remain in the lines and another to leave them and offer battle; the matter was referred to Richelieu. "When the king," he answered, "confided the command to you he believed you to be capable; leave your lines or not as you see fit; you will answer with your heads if the town is not taken." Some days later the Spaniards were defeated and the town carried, a second province being thus wrested from the house of Austria (August, 1640).

France was at the same time carrying on war in northern Italy. After the death of Victor Amadeus (1640) his brothers, Prince Thomas of Carignano and Cardinal Maurice, disputed the regency with his widow Christine, a daughter of Henry IV., and secured the support of a Spanish army. Richelieu sent Count d'Harcourt into Piedmont; he gained three brilliant victories at Casal, Turin, and Ivrea, restored the authority of the regent, and by a very skilful treaty induced the Savoyard princes to return to the French alliance (1640–1642).

After this Spain abandoned the offensive and devoted her attention to defending herself against the Catalans and Portugal. The cardinal supported both revolts, furnishing help to John of Braganza, the new King of Portugal, and persuading the Catalans in 1641 to recognise Louis XIII. as Count of Barcelona and Roussillon. A French army, under La Mothe-Houdancourt, invaded Catalonia and expelled the Spaniards; another, under the king in person, took Perpignan and added Roussillon to France (September, 1642).

Spain being occupied at home, it was more easy to overcome Austria in Germany. The defeat of Nördlingen and the defection of the Elector of Saxony had compelled the Swedes to retire into Pomerania. Assisted by the powerful diversion effected by France, Banner, "the second Gustavus," resumed the offensive in 1636 and defeated the imperialists at Wittstock. After a second victory at Chemnitz, he penetrated into Bohemia, and assisted by the Count de Guébriant, one of the ablest tacticians of the period, tried to capture the diet of the empire and the emperor at Ratisbon (1641). He passed the Danube on the ice, but a thaw saved Ferdinand III., who was delivered some months later from his formidable adversary by death. While Banner's successor, the paralytic Torstensen, astonished Europe by the rapidity of his movements and by a series of glorious victories in Silesia and Saxony (1642), Guébriant boldly advanced with the former army of Bernhard of Saxe-Weimar into the west of the empire, which the Swedes attacked from the north-east. He defeated Piccolomini at Wolfenbüttel (1641), Lamboi at Kempen in the electorate of Cologne (1642), and rendered help to all the malcontents of Germany.

In choosing his allies Richelieu cared little what they might be called; it mattered nothing to him whether they were Protestants or Republicans if they could serve France. The King of England in 1638 answered his overtures with pride and threats. "We will soon see," said Richelieu, "whether he is in a position to despise me." And his agents aided in fomenting that disaffection among the Presbyterians of Scotland which soon afterwards led to the Great Rebellion.

Death of Richelieu (December, 1642).—It was in the midst of such success that Richelieu died at the age of fifty-seven. On December 1, 1642, he was seized by an illness the gravity of which he soon recognised. Next day he wished to discover the truth about his condition. He was answered in the hopeful phrases with which it is usual to encourage the sick. "Speak freely," he said to one of his doctors. "Monseigneur, in twenty-four hours you will be dead or cured." "That is the way to talk," he answered, and sent for the curé of St. Eustace who brought him the viaticum. "Behold my judge," he said, when they presented the Host to him, "before whom I shall soon appear; I pray that he will condemn me if I have cared for anything save the good of religion and the state." "Do you pardon your enemies?" asked the curé. "I have never had any save those of the state." He left France everywhere victorious, the house

of Austria defeated, the realm increased by the addition of the four provinces of Lorraine, Roussillon, Artois, and Alsace; Catalonia and Portugal roused against Spain, and the Swedes and French at the gates of Vienna. He had kept the promise which he had made to Louis XIII. on becoming minister. Abroad he had raised the reputation of the king to the height which it ought to reach among foreign nations. At home everything was brought under the authority of the crown. But in internal affairs the country had passed from one danger to another; freed from aristocratic licence, it had fallen under the despotic sway of the king, who, regarding himself as above all law, placed himself also above all justice and disposed at his pleasure of the lives, fortune, and liberty of his subjects. Not only do arbitrary confiscations and imprisonments appear, but capital sentences were pronounced by mere letters-patent addressed to the parliament.

Richelieu was not the systematic foe of aristocracy. He subdued the great men but did not abase the nobility. He had, perhaps, all the horror of a St. Simon for a medley of classes. He desired every one to remain in his own station, and though himself sprung from a very humble family he believed that birth could make up for most deficiencies and demanded nothing so rigorously, even when making a bishop. He disliked the position which the bourgeoisie had already acquired in the state. "They are presumptuous to the point of wishing to have the first place, whereas they are entitled only to the third. This is so against reason and so contrary to the welfare of your majesty's service that it is absolutely needful to check the growth of such ideas, since otherwise France will never be that which she has been and which she ought to be once more, but will become a monstrous body without either substance or durability." And as he was not in the habit of shrinking from the logical application of his principles, he attempted, in the general regulation of all the affairs of the kingdom in 1625, to suppress all colleges; there were not twelve towns in which he left one Jesuit and one secular college; at Paris there were only three lay and one Jesuit—"In order to prevent the mania of the poor for educating their children, which distracts them from the pursuit of trade and war." He demanded merchants and soldiers from the third estate. With the same end in view he maintained the sale of offices, which served to render them hereditary and hence to retain the bourgeoisie in the pursuit of trade.

He is open to blame for his mismanagement of finance, but he

regarded taxation from a dual point of view, as a means for supplying resources to the state and as a means of keeping the people in subjection. "All students of politics are agreed," he said, "that if the people lived too much at ease it would be impossible to keep them within the bounds of their duty. If they were free from taxation they would aspire to be released also from obedience." And he compared them to mules, "Which are more spoiled by long rest than by hard work."

The French Academy: The Sorbonne, Palais Royal, and Jardin des Plantes.—The terrible cardinal had not merely a longing for power; he had also a taste for letters and arts, and many useful or magnificent establishments arose during his rule. He founded the French Academy in 1635, which he designed to supervise the French language and to watch over literary taste. He reconstituted the Sorbonne, where his tomb, the masterpiece of Girardon, may still be seen. He built the College du Plessis and the Palais Cardinal, later the Palais Royal. He founded the royal printing press, the Jardin des Plantes, now the Natural History Museum, for the instruction of medical students. He showed deference to writers to which they were little accustomed, pensioned *savants* and poets, Corneille among others. He encouraged the painter Vouet and brought Poussin from Rome. He saw the dawn of a great literary age in France, no less than a great political age, since the *Cid* appeared in 1636 and the *Discours de la Méthode* in 1637. He was himself a remarkable writer; if he erred in writing tragedies and in believing himself to be the equal of Corneille, he composed many theological works much esteemed in his own day, and wrote his *Mémoires* and *Testament Politique*, which are admired at the present time. The emphatic and pretentious style of the period often appears in his writings, but also an energy worthy even of Corneille.

Death of Louis XIII.—Louis XIII. did not change his policy after the cardinal's death; he called to his council a man who was able to continue it, Jules Mazarin, the friend of the late minister and imbued with his ideas. Louis only survived Richelieu six months; they were inseparable in life; they are inseparable in history.

Louis hardly merits the contempt which has been poured upon him, although it is idle to pretend, with St. Simon, that fate has given to the minister the glory which should belong to the master. But he maintained for eighteen years a minister whom he liked little; he made him less an adviser than the sole possessor of authority and the dictator of France. This accep-

tance of a minister, whose demands were often hard and sometimes cruel to bear, must be counted to the credit of the king; it indicates a rare devotion to the public good. Louis had courage and sometimes decision of mind and he showed on the throne a virtue rare in those days, a chastity equal to that of St. Louis, his mistresses being no more than his platonic friends.

Louis XIII. began the building of Versailles. The lordship of that place belonged to the Bishops of Paris, who were raised to the archiepiscopal dignity in 1622. Louis XIII. bought Versailles in 1627 and built a small château there, which his son preserved; it formed the centre of the palace at the end of the marble court. Red brick was used in its construction, but Louis XIV. abandoned this in his additions.

CHAPTER XLIX

MINORITY OF LOUIS XIV. AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF MAZARIN (1643–1661)

Regency of Anne of Austria.—The eldest son of Louis XIII. was less than five years old. His father, who was distrustful of the queen, who had engaged under Richelieu in all the intrigues of the nobles, had left her the regency, but had placed round her a council which was to decide everything by a majority. Anne of Austria was not prepared to accept the control of guides after having been so long under the domination of masters; she flattered the parliament, declaring that she would always be well at ease if she had the advice of so august an assemblage, and at the same time demanded that her husband's last wishes should be annulled. The parliament, delighted at re-entering with so much éclat the sphere of politics, annulled the king's will with the same facility as it would have decided the case of some private person. Anne of Austria was proclaimed regent and empowered to choose such persons as seemed fit to her to deliberate with her on matters laid before them. To the astonishment of the whole court, the first adviser whom the queen selected was the friend and political heir of Richelieu, Cardinal Mazarin.

Mazarin.—Mazarin was born in 1602 of an old Sicilian family settled at Rome. Being sent as nuncio to France in 1634 he attracted the attention of Richelieu, who attached him to his own fortune and secured for him the Roman purple. The queen

entrusted herself to this man, heir to the designs of the great cardinal, to this stranger who could have in France no interest other than that of the king; she allowed him to secure an absolute empire over her mind, even over her heart.

"He had a great, farseeing, and inventive mind, a straightforward and true judgment; his character was supple rather than weak, less firm than persevering; his motto was, 'Time is on my side.' He acted not according to his likes and dislikes but by calculation. Ambition had mastered his sense of personal honour; he cared not what was said, provided that he gained his end; he was insensible to injuries and only avoided obstacles. He was a rare judge of men, but he aided his judgment by that which the world had pronounced. Before giving his confidence to any man he used to ask, 'Is he happy?' This question was not the result of some blind belief in fate; for him, to be happy meant the possession of a spirit which prepared and a character which could master fortune. He was incapable of depression, and despite his apparent inconsistencies, his constancy was remarkable. One of his wisest enemies said of him that he had more courage in his heart than in his mind, in contradistinction to Cardinal Richelieu, who had more courage in his mind than in his heart. If Richelieu, who was liable to extremes of depression, had fallen from power, he would never have risen again, whereas Mazarin, twice a fugitive, never allowed himself to be discouraged, governed from his place of exile, and returned to die in the supreme position and in the greatest grandeur."

Cabale des Importants.—All those who had suffered with or for the queen hastened to court and, believing themselves to be already masters of the state, assumed airs of superiority and protection which won for their party the nickname of *Cabale des Importants*. Among them were the Duke of Vendôme, legitimatised son of Henry IV. by Gabrielle d'Estrées; his two sons, the Duke of Mercœur and the Duke of Beaufort, who was surnamed the *roi-des-halles;* the young and brilliant Marsillas, Duke of La Rochefoucauld, who later wrote his *Maximes;* Potier, Bishop of Beauvais, first almoner of the queen, whom Cardinal de Retz irreverently called a *mitred beast,* who entered the council with the title of minister of state and whose first despatch, according to Gondi, was a summons to the Dutch to return to the Catholic Church if they wished to retain the alliance of France. The avowed aim of the *Importants* was to undo the work of Richelieu. The Duchess of Chevreuse, the former friend of the queen, returned to the Louvre after ten

years of exile, and loudly declared that it was necessary to restore to the nobles all that Louis XIII. had taken from them, but that since the queen had received power she had become greedy. If she had been unwilling to share her position with able councillors, it was not that she was ready to hand it over to these turbulent men and women, who resumed their plots and would soon renew civil war. The discovery of an attempt to murder Mazarin decided her to break the last ties that united her with her former friends. Potier was relegated to his see; Beaufort was sent to the donjon of Vincennes; Vendôme, the Duchess de Chevreuse, and the rest to their country houses. The reign of the *Importants* lasted three months and a half (September 2, 1643). It is said that about this time Anne, finding herself in Richelieu's house at Rueil, stopped before his portrait, looked at it for some time in silence, and said, "If that man were still alive he would be more powerful than ever."

Continuation of the Thirty Years' War: Victories of Condé and Turenne.—The foreign war continued. The death of Richelieu emboldened the Spaniards, who resumed the offensive on the side of Champagne and besieged Rocroi under the leadership of an old commander, Don Francisco de Mellos, hoping that when the town was taken they would reach Paris without opposition, since they had before them only an inferior army and a general of twenty-one, Louis de Bourbon, then Duke d'Enghien and afterwards the great Condé. The armies met each other on May 19, 1643, the wings, formed by the cavalry, becoming engaged before the centres met. Condé at the head of the right wing defeated the cavalry opposed to him. Learning that his left had been beaten by Mellos, he boldly passed behind the rear of the Spanish army, attacked the enemy's right in the rear and dispersed it. The Spanish infantry remained immovable. Condé turned to it, surrounded it, attacked three times, and broke it. The old Count de Fuentes, who commanded it, fell dead on the field. Condé himself was three times wounded in the arm by musket fire. He followed up his success with that vigour and happy audacity which was characteristic of this new Alexander. Each year was marked by a victory. The Spaniards were expelled from France, Thionville was taken by storm (August, 1643), and Condé turned against Austria and her German allies. The army of Bernhard of Weimar captured Rottweil, but lost there its capable general, Guébriant, and obeying his various successors with little willingness, permitted itself to be surprised by the imperialists at Duttlingen. Turenne, appointed

marshal, rallied the remnants of the army and reconstituted it. Condé joined him with 10,000 men and together they attacked the Bavarian general, Mercy, under the walls of Friedburg in Breisgau. The battle was renewed on three different days; on each occasion Condé displayed the most brilliant courage, rallying the French who were electrified by his daring (August, 1644). The fight was rather a hideous massacre than a battle; Mercy's retreat was undisturbed, but he admitted that he was defeated by allowing the two generals to take Philipsburg, Worms, Mainz, and to press back the enemy to the Rhine. While Condé returned to Paris to enjoy the applause of the people, Turenne advanced too confidently across the empire in response to the appeal of Torstensen to join him before Vienna, and was defeated at Marienthal by Mercy (May, 1645). Condé hastened up with reinforcements, forced the enemy to retire, penetrated into Bavaria, and routed the imperial army in the bloody battle of Nördlingen, where Mercy was killed (August, 1646). In 1646 he passed into Flanders; he besieged Dunkirk in view of the Spanish army and for the first time gave this place to France. In the following year he went to Catalonia, where failures were to be repaired, besieged Lerida, which two marshals had already attacked in vain, and was repulsed. It was his first defeat and he repaired it in another theatre of war. His absence had restored the courage of the Spaniards in the north, and the Archduke Leopold, brother of the emperor, had advanced as far as Lens in Artois. Condé attacked him with his usual vigour and in two hours the battle was won (August 10, 1648).

Turenne continued his operations in Germany and by his wise and bold tactics laid the foundations of a reputation which has only grown with lapse of time. United with the Swedes under Wrangel, the successor of Torstensen, he won the battles of Lavingen (November, 1647) and Zusmarshausen (May, 1648). He expelled the Elector of Bavaria from his lands at the age of eighty, and in a torrential rain, which suddenly caused the Inn to rise in flood, he marched on Vienna. The imperial council discussed the advisability of Ferdinand III. flying from his capital.

Treaty of Westphalia (1648).—Negotiations had long been proceeding. Proposed in 1641, conferences were opened in April, 1643, in two Westphalian towns, Münster and Osnabrück. It was necessary to remodel the map of Europe after a war which had lasted thirty years, to give the empire a new constitution, and to regulate the public law and religious system of most European

nations. France was represented at the congress by able negotiators, the Count d'Avaux and Abel Servien, but the best diplomatists were Condé and Turenne, whose swords had simplified the discussions and made peace essential. At the last moment Spain withdrew, hoping to profit from the troubles of the Fronde, which then began in France. The other states, urged to make an end of the negotiations, signed the treaty (October 24, 1648).

In the Thirty Years' War Austria had attempted to stifle the religious and political liberties of Germany; being conquered, that which she had wished to destroy continued to exist and increase. The Protestants received full liberty of conscience and the authority of the emperor, which had recently threatened, was reduced to a shadow. The princes of Germany and the states of Germany, confirmed in the full and entire exercise of sovereignty over their lands, were obliged merely to accept an empty restriction that they should do nothing against the emperor or the empire.

The two powers which had secured this defeat of Austria had stipulated for important indemnities for themselves. Sweden received the island of Rügen, Wismar, Western Pomerania with Stettin, the archbishopric of Bremen, and the bishopric of Verden, thus securing the mouths of three great German rivers, the Oder, Elbe, and Weser, with 5,000,000 crowns and three votes in the diet.

France continued to occupy Lorraine, under a promise to restore it to the duke when he should accept the French conditions. She also secured the renunciation of all imperial rights to the Three Bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun, which she had held for a century; to the town of Pignerol, ceded by the Duke of Savoy in 1631; to Alsace, which was abandoned to her with the exception of Strasburg. Her frontier was thus carried over the Vosges to the Rhine. On the right bank of that river she held Breisach and received the right to garrison Philippsburg. The free navigation of the Rhine was guaranteed.

These advantages were great, since by conquering Alsace France placed herself on the one side between Lorraine and Germany, and on the other to the north of Franche-Comté, which since the time of Henry IV. she had enveloped on the south. As a result these two provinces were henceforth at the mercy of France and their reunion with her was merely a question of time.

France not only effected a better definition of her frontiers for defensive purposes, but also assumed an offensive position. By

means of Pignerol she gained a footing beyond the Alps in Italy; by means of Breisach and Philippsburg she gained a footing beyond the Rhine in Germany. By securing the recognition of the right of the German states to contract alliances with foreign powers she gained the means of buying the aid of some at least among those needy princes, and by guaranteeing the execution of the treaty she gave herself the right of constant intervention in the affairs of Germany. The empire being a mere conglomeration of 360 states, Lutheran and Catholic, monarchical and republican, lay and ecclesiastical, necessarily became the theatre of all intrigues, the battlefield of Europe, as Italy became at the beginning of the nineteenth century for the same reason, full of divisions and anarchy.

The Treaty of Westphalia, which formed the basis of all diplomatic agreements from the middle of the seventeenth century to the French Revolution, ended the supremacy of the house of Austria in Europe and prepared the way for the ascendancy of the house of Bourbon.

Internal Government from 1643 to 1661.—While Mazarin continued so gloriously the policy of Richelieu, his authority in France was shaken by factions. It was a week after the battle of Lens that the *Day of the Barricades* occurred. The chief minister had at first attempted to excuse his eminent position and foreign birth by an affectation of gentleness, complacency, and modesty. "On the steps of the throne, from which the stern and formidable Richelieu had rather crushed than governed mankind, there appeared a mild and kindly successor, who desired nothing, who was reduced to despair that his dignity of cardinal did not permit him to humble himself before all men as he wished, who passed along the streets with two small lacqueys following his carriage." All language, it was said, was comprised in five short words, "The queen is so good." But this golden age, so vaunted by contemporary poets, did not last long.

The reign of Louis XIII. left a legacy of vast financial embarrassment to Cardinal Mazarin, which he increased by his faulty administration. He needed much money to carry on the foreign war, to win over the nobles by pensioning them, and to satisfy his own scandalous avarice. Emeri, the superintendent of finance, was another Italian, unpopular as finance ministers always were in France, though he was but little concerned at this, saying, "Financiers are made only to be cursed." In full council he declared that good faith was a virtue fit only for merchants. He had not been guilty of that virtue himself;

twenty years before he had been condemned as a fraudulent bankrupt. His financial expedients were onerous and vexatious. He borrowed at 25 per cent.; he created offices that he might sell them; he reduced by one quarter the amounts payable to the annual creditors of the state; he embezzled a part of the salaries of officials. Finally he enforced with rigour an ordinance of 1548 which had become obsolete, by which it was prohibited to build in the faubourgs of Paris except within certain limits under pain of demolition and fine, and by the *edit-du-toisé* he compelled the owners to redeem the punishments imposed on offenders by a cash payment (1644). The taxes were collected with such rigour that in 1646 there were at one time 23,000 persons imprisoned for financial offences, of whom 5000 died. In August, 1648, there was general bankruptcy, "the creditors of the state being either paupers or too rich." This financial crisis was the origin of the *Fronde*[1]; the *Day of the Barricades* occurred on August 26.

Resistance of the Parliament to Royal Authority.—Since, owing to the creation of the *paulette*, offices had become a heritable property, their saleable value naturally rose. This had its influence on those who give to prosperity that consideration which is its due, and especially so when that prosperity is united to dignity of manners, patriotism, and superior intellectual capacity. The magistrates gained, from their security of tenure and the consideration with which they were regarded, a spirit of boldness and independence which made parliament a centre of opposition in which the traditions of the nation and the principles of the monarchy against favourites, nobles, clergy, and sometimes the crown itself were defended. After the death of Richelieu, parliament more than once attempted resistance, and permitted itself to be termed the born protector of the people. The threat, uttered from time to time, to repay the sums paid for offices and as a result to destroy the hereditary character of public functions, though not meant seriously, was yet annoying. Financial exigencies afforded an excellent pretext for bold talk, as parliament appeared to be voicing the opinion of the people. It opposed the *edit-du-toisé* in 1644; it opposed a tariff edict of 1646, which regulated and raised the duties payable on merchandise entering Paris. Omer Talon states that the members of parliament were specially angered by this edict, which forced them to pay duty on fruit coming from their country houses. Only after long discussions was the edict authorised

[1] The party opposed to the court during the minority of Louis XIV.

for two years. Further financial edicts caused the beginning of a riot (January, 1647), one was even aimed at the officers of the sovereign courts. On this occasion parliament became thoroughly refractory and definitely launched into politics. The heads of its members were turned by the popularity which they had won as a result of their persevering resistance to the minister, and the magistrates declared that they occupied the place of the States-General, that they were equal to the English parliament, which was then conducting a revolution, and on May 13, 1648, the members of the four sovereign courts, the parliament, the chamber of accounts, the court of *aides*, and the grand council, united in the hall of St. Louis in the Palais de Justice, "to serve the public and the individual, and to reform the abuses of the state."

Mazarin at first annulled their decree of union, and then, changing his mind, authorised the deliberations of this assembly, which claimed to give a new constitution to France, persuading the regent to yield though not without difficulty. "You are brave," he remarked to her, "with the courage of a soldier who does not realise his danger."

Mazarin had grounds for his remark. The danger was great, for the masses began to deal with questions which had not been dealt with for a long time and the discussion of which foreboded revolution. "Parliament murmured," says Cardinal de Retz, "hardly had it raised its voice than the world awakened. The members groped about for laws and found none. They were terrified; they cried to each other; they demanded laws. And in this agitation the people entered the sanctuary; they tore aside the veil which should ever hide that which may be said and believed of popular rights and the prerogative of kings, two things which are ever most in accord when their accord is least mentioned. The hall of the Palais de Justice profaned all these mysteries."

The assembly offered for the acceptance of the king twenty-seven articles, which were in future to constitute the fundamental law of the kingdom. Some of these demands were excellent, some were less beneficial, the majority were impracticable. The most important demand was that henceforth taxes should not be legally enforceable unless they had been discussed and registered, with free suffrage, by the parliament of Paris. This clause would have transferred to an aristocracy of 200 magistrates who had bought their offices a portion of the legislative power. Another reform proposed would have struck a

heavy blow at the centralised administration created by Richelieu, by the abolition of the intendants of provinces. The assembly was better inspired when it demanded serious guarantees in favour of individual liberty, the suppression of sealed orders, of extraordinary tribunals, and above all, that all persons arrested by royal order should be interrogated within twenty-four hours or released.

Day of the Barricades (August 26, 1648): Matthew Molé: Coadjutor de Retz.—At this very moment Condé gained the victory of Lens. The king, who was then only ten years old, cried on hearing the news, "Parliament will be furious," and this striking success gave heart to the cardinal, who resolved to remove the three most obstinate magistrates, Novion Blancménil, Charton, and Broussel. "They were not the chiefs of a party, but the instruments of such chiefs," says Voltaire. Charton, a very narrow-minded man, was known by the nickname of "President *Je dis ça*," because he began and ended every speech with these words. Broussel had nothing to recommend him except his white hairs, his hatred of Mazarin, and the reputation which he enjoyed of always opposing the court on whatever matter might be under discussion. His colleagues had a poor opinion of him, but the people idolised him. Instead of arresting them quietly in the silence of the night, the cardinal thought that he would impress the people by arresting them at midday, while the *Te Deum* was being chanted at Notre-Dame for the victory of Lens, and while the Swiss guards were carrying to the church seventy-three flags captured from the enemy. It was just this step that caused the subversion of the kingdom. Charton escaped; Blancménil was taken without difficulty; but Broussel's old servant, seeing his master borne off in a coach, roused the people. The shops were shut; the heavy iron chains at the entrance of the principal streets were drawn across, and 400,000 voices cried *Liberty and Broussel!* (August 26, 1648).

Two hundred barricades were raised in a moment; they were extended to within a hundred paces of the Palais Royal. Parliament in a body went to the queen, being permitted to cross the barricades, to demand the release of the imprisoned members, which they failed to obtain. On their return they were stopped by the infuriated mob, and an iron merchant, the captain of this district, seized the first president, Matthew Molé, by the arm, threatening him with a pistol, and shouting, "Go back, traitor, and if you wish not to be massacred with your fellows, bring

Broussel back to us or Mazarin as a hostage." Many of the members took to flight, others hesitated, but their leader did not flinch. He was insulted, some of the mob pulling his beard which he wore very long. He spoke to them, as if he were seated on his chair in the parliament, and with a calm and serious expression. "When you have killed me," he remarked to them, "I shall require six feet of earth." The authority of his manner mastered the mob and the most violent of the rioters; he returned slowly to the palace, amid a shower of injuries, execrations, and blasphemies. "This man," says Cardinal de Retz, who relates this fine example of courage, "is, in my opinion, the most intrepid that this age has produced."

Nevertheless, the riot spread. The magistrates attempted a new negotiation with Anne of Austria, and the Queen of England, who was the victim of another revolution which had begun in a less menacing manner, influenced the regent to yield. Calm was at once restored, "The city seemed in an instant to be quieter than on an Ash Wednesday."

The Coadjutor of Paris, Paul de Gondi, Cardinal de Retz, who had taken so decisive a part in this victorious revolution, was descended from a Florentine family, which came to the French court in the train of Catherine de Medici and had there made its fortune. As if to recall his Italian origin, he wrote at the age of eighteen his *Conjuration du Comte de Fiesque*, on reading which Richelieu had remarked, "This is a dangerous mind." Five years later, Gondi formed, with some other young nobles, a plan for assassinating the cardinal. He boasts in his *Mémoires* that he had studied the art of conspiracy in the *Lives* of Plutarch and in the *Cataline* of Sallust. With such a disposition he entered the Church and in 1643 was named colleague to his uncle, then Archbishop of Paris. But his ambition soared above this dignity. He aspired to the rôle of a Richelieu, and he used his position only in order to gain popularity in Paris, preaching to make himself known to the people, being prodigal of alms to make himself loved, ruining himself in advance to pay for the civil war. When reproached for his extravagance, he retorted, "Caesar at my age owed six times as much as I do." He did not fear to be compared with Caesar, with Richelieu; he believed that he had in him the making of a great man and he persuaded others to believe it also; circumstances made him merely a firebrand.

Peace of St. Germain.—The Day of the Barricades had alarmed the court, and it entered upon negotiations. On October 24,

1648, the ordinance of St. Germain granted all the demands of the chamber of St. Louis, associating the magistracy to a certain extent in the exercise of sovereign power. On the same day the Treaty of Westphalia was signed.

War of the Fronde: The Parliament and the Nobles (January to April, 1649).—When he gave way Mazarin had no idea save to gain time, and when he was freed from the external war he resolved to make an end of this faction of "king's men, who murdered the royal authority." On January 6, 1649, Anne of Austria left Paris with her children and summoned troops around her. Parliament, unable to contend single-handed with the court, demanded or accepted the services of the princes and young lords, who were ready to amuse themselves with a civil war against a minister who would in no case execute them. Among these nobles were the Prince of Conti, brother of Condé; the Duke of Longueville, who had married Condé's sister; the Duke of Bouillon, who still mourned the loss of Sedan; the Duke of La Rochefoucauld, who charged the queen and Mazarin with ingratitude; and even the wise Turenne. The soul of the plot was the coadjutor, who ruled Paris by means of his sermons, his alms, and his verses. "I needed," he says, with singular frankness, in his *Mémoires*, "some figurehead that I might place before me, and by good luck I found this figurehead in the grandson of the great Henry, who spoke as they speak in the markets—an unusual characteristic in the children of the great Henry—and who had long, fair locks. It is enough to consider the weight of these circumstances and to consider the effect that they had on the people." This figurehead was the Duke of Beaufort, a prince of little brain but of great courage, facts which made him an excellent tool in the able hands of de Retz. The cardinal also tried to win over Condé, but the prince answered proudly, "I am called Louis de Bourbon and I have no desire to disturb the crown." Thus the struggle began, which deserves the name given it by history, the name of a children's game, the *Fronde*.

"The queen, with tears in her eyes, urged Condé to act as the protector of the king, and the victor of Rocroi, Friedburg, Nördlingen, and Lens, could not undo such great services. He was flattered at the honour of defending a court, which he felt to be ungrateful, against the *Fronde* which had sought his support. The parliament has thus to fight the great Condé, and it dared to undertake the war. In the great chamber, generals were appointed to command a non-existent army. All were taxed to raise troops. There were twenty councillors holding new offices

created by Richelieu ; they had each to pay 15,000 livres for the expenses of the war in order to purchase the tolerance of their colleagues. The great chamber, the courts of inquests, requests, accounts, and *aides*, which had constantly exclaimed against insignificant and necessary taxes, furnished almost ten millions for the subversion of the state. By decree of parliament 12,000 men were levied ; each *porte cochère* [1] had to furnish a man and a horse, and this cavalry was termed the *cavalerie des portes cochères*. The coadjutor had a regiment which was named the *Corinthian regiment*, as de Retz was titular Archbishop of Corinth."

"Had not the King of France, Condé, and the capital been involved in the struggle, the war of the *Fronde* would have been as ridiculous as that of the Barbarini. No one knew why they were in arms. Condé with 8000 soldiers besieged 100,000 burghers. The Parisians made a *sortie*, adorned with plumes and ribbons ; their evolutions were a jest to the wits. They fled as soon as they met 200 men of the royal army. Everything was made a jest. The Corinthian regiment having been beaten by a small force, this defeat was termed 'the first to the Corinthians.' The twenty councillors who had each furnished 15,000 livres had merely the honour of being called the *quinze-vingts*."

"The Parisian troops who ventured out of Paris and always returned beaten were received with hisses and roars of laughter. These small checks were made good by couplets and epigrams. The inns were the tents in which councils of war were held, amid joking, songs, and the most dissolute gaiety. Finally, when the coadjutor attended a sitting of the parliament with a dagger in his pocket, the handle was detected, and they cried out, 'See our archbishop's breviary.'"

But the *Fronde* must not be made more insignificant than it actually was. Men knew perfectly well why they were in arms. The princes regretted their place in the council ; the nobles their lost importance. Parliament wished to play that part in the state which the English parliament played across the Channel, and the people, who saw in all this only a reduction of taxation, which was then their great desire, rallied to the princes, magistrates, and to their archbishop. As for de Retz, he trusted that a reaction against the system of Richelieu would raise him to power. This was, then, no chance undertaking ; the absurdity of the *Fronde* lies not in any uncertainty as to its aims, but in the fact that its success was impossible. A struggle against royal

[1] Literally, each stable.

authority between the death of Richelieu and the majority of Louis XIV. was impossible and in politics the impossible readily becomes the ridiculous, since the defeated will never be honoured.

The magistrates were the first to wish to abandon the wreck. They quickly realised that the nobles sought only to perpetuate disorder in the hope of overturning all government, and the lawyers at that time were often more patriotic than the soldiers whose interests frequently lay beyond the frontiers. At Paris Matthew Molé rejected with indignation a suggestion that a Spanish envoy should be admitted to a sitting of the parliament. At Bordeaux, shortly afterwards, the president, d'Affis, gave a safe-conduct to an accredited agent of the Princess of Condé, who was then commanding in the town. The news of a treaty with Spain signed by the nobles decided the parliament; the first president was empowered to treat with Mazarin. The convention of Rueil reduced some taxes, authorised the assembly of the chambers, and after some delay the court returned to Paris (April, 1649).

Party of the Petits-Maîtres, or Young Fronde: Arrest of Condé (January, 1650).—The peace was of short duration, though the king had paid dearly for it, "all the nobles having snatched some little rag of royal generosity." Condé, wishing to dominate the government which he had protected, wearied the regent and Mazarin by constant demands and humiliated them by his insolence and bad taste. He wrote to the cardinal, *All' illustrissimo signor Faquino*, and one day, taking leave of him, said, *Adieu, Mars!* This haughty conduct did not preclude his employment of less lofty methods. To undermine the credit of the minister at the point from which he gained the greatest support, Condé employed one of his *petits-maîtres*, Jarzé, to play with the queen the rôle which Buckingham was credited with having once enjoyed. This was a tactical stroke of some merit, but on this occasion Condé was beaten. At the same time as he alienated the court he caused discontent among the old party of the *Fronde*. He had nothing but contempt for the burghers who had aspired to rule the state; he surrounded himself with young nobles, vain and presumptuous, who pushed the faults of their chief to an extreme and were called the *petits-maîtres*. It was easy for Mazarin to unite every one against this prince, who knew better how to win battles than to gain hearts, and he caused him to be arrested at the Louvre, with his brother, Conti, and his brother-in-law, Longueville (January, 1650). "The people of Paris," says Voltaire, "who had made barricades for a

councillor clerk who was almost imbecile, made bonfires when the defender and hero of France was carried to the donjon of Vincennes." Voltaire did not see that this was the old democratic leaven of the city which began to ferment. "The people alone make kings," cried the advocate Deboisle in full parliament. "Let us throw off the mask," says a contemporary pamphlet, "let us recognise that the nobles are only great men because we carry them on our shoulders; we have only to shake them off to strew them on the ground and to strike a blow which shall be renowned for ever." This menacing voice was then but an echo; it was destined to be heard more clearly a century and a half later.

Union of the Two Frondes: Exile of Mazarin (February, 1651).—An outbreak occurred in some provinces and was easily repressed. Bordeaux submitted, and du Plessis-Praslin defeated Turenne at Rethel, Turenne having invaded Champagne with a Spanish army (December, 1650). But Mazarin believed too soon that he was victorious. He had promised the coadjutor a cardinal's hat, in order to bring him over to the side of the queen; when this had been done, according to his manner he forgot his promise. De Retz effected a reconciliation with the party of Condé, revived the distrust of the parliament, excited the people; the two *Frondes*, temporarily united by his labours, forced Anne of Austria to release the princes and to expel her chief minister from the realm. Mazarin retired to Cologne and from his exile continued to rule the queen and France (February, 1651). The coadjutor at last secured the hat.

In order to secure the release of the princes, 800 nobles of the most important families of France assembled at Paris and began to deliberate on the disorders of the state, the ruin of the old constitution, and the loss of their rights and franchises. The clergy, which held its quinquennial meeting at the same time, appeared disposed to make common cause with the nobles. There was talk of a States-General; but the two privileged orders allowed their jealousy of the parliament to appear too soon, declaring that the lawyers "wished to make the state a horrible monster by adding a fourth member to a perfect body composed of the clergy, the nobles, and the third estate." They showed their resentment against "these young scholars who left college to pose as the arbiters of the commonwealth in virtue of a piece of parchment costing 60,000 crowns." The parliament became distrustful of such allies, and the union of the two *Frondes* was short lived.

Revolt of Condé: Combat of Bléneau (April, 1652).—Condé was dissatisfied with every one, with the parliament, with Paris, and with the court. When Mazarin, before his exile, had opened the gates of his prison, Condé had believed that the queen would give him supreme power in compensation for his two years of captivity. But Mazarin ruled from his place of exile. Irritated at the isolation in which he was left, Condé engaged in the most culpable undertakings. He retired to the south, resolved to conquer power by force of arms, and perhaps even to seize the throne, if credit may be given to the memoirs of the Count de Coligny, one of the companions of his revolt. He raised Guienne and treated with Spain, while his friends prepared for war in the heart of France. Mazarin, who had meanwhile returned to France (December, 1651), confided the command of the army to Turenne, who had rejoined the royalist party. The marshal advanced to the Loire to surprise the army of the princes, believing Condé to be a hundred leagues from him. But the prince had traversed France on horseback, alone and in disguise. As soon as he had arrived, he fell upon the quarters of Marshal d'Hocquincourt at Bléneau and dispersed his men (April, 1652). The fugitives took refuge at Briare, where Turenne was. The marshal rode to the top of a hill, which commanded the plain, and observed by the light of burning villages the disposition of the rival forces. "M. le Prince has arrived," he said, "and commands his army." The terrified court talked of flight to Bourges; Turenne reassured them, and by means of a combination of audacity and prudence, with 4000 men against 12,000, prevented the enemy from following up their advantage. "Marshal, you have saved the state," said the queen to him, weeping, "without you, there was not a town that would not have closed its gates to the king."

Fight of the Faubourg St. Antoine (July, 1652).—The attitude of Paris was the critical problem. The two armies sought an answer at Paris itself, and the city closed its gates to both. The rival forces met in the Faubourg St. Antoine, and a bloody and indecisive battle occurred. The Duke of Orleans, always hesitant, remained shut up in the Luxemburg palace; the archiepiscopal palace sheltered de Retz; the parliament awaited the issue of the fight before taking any steps. The queen in tears prostrated herself in the chapel of the Carmelites. Condé fought as a soldier and was everywhere. "I did not see one Condé but a dozen," said Turenne. The army of the *Fronde*, threatened on its flanks, was in danger of being enveloped and destroyed, when made-

moiselle, daughter of Gaston of Orleans, caused the gates to be opened to Condé and turned the cannon of the Bastille on the royal troops. Turenne, in amazement, retreated. Such was the misery among the poor of Paris that they fell on the horses killed in the battle, and this horse-flesh was sold at ten sols a pound. Condé could not remain long in Paris; his glory was tarnished by a massacre of the Mazarins, which he allowed to occur though he did not order it. He left the city (October 18) and went to Flanders to the Spaniards. The feudal tradition was still strong enough for a crowd of nobles to follow him, bringing with them an army of at least 10,000 men, composed of the regiments of the princes and their friends.

Return of Mazarin (February, 1653)—This first emigration was, like the emigration of a later date, fatal to the emigrants, and accelerated the revulsion of popular feeling towards the king. Mazarin, in order not to hinder the reconciliation, permitted himself to be exiled a second time (August 9). The parliament and the citizens then prayed the queen-mother to return to the pacified capital (October 21). Ten magistrates were removed or imprisoned; Cardinal de Retz was confined at Vincennes; Condé was condemned to death for contumacy; and Gaston was exiled to Blois. Three months later Mazarin returned all-powerful and with the proud pomp of a sovereign (February, 1653). This was the end of the *Fronde*, but the events of this period, when the king and his mother fled in disorder before some firebrands and lay almost under their beds at St. Germain, left an ineffaceable impress on the mind of Louis XIV., which urged him to the establishment of absolute government. When he returned to Paris (October 22, 1652), he compelled the registration of a decree declaring it forbidden to members of the parliament to concern themselves in any way with the general affairs of the state and the direction of finance. There is a story, graphic but not authentic, that some time later, when parliament had assembled to prepare remonstrances on the matter of some edicts, the king returned from Vincennes, where he was hunting, and entered the great hall in his riding boots, whip in hand. "Gentlemen," he said, "the evils which your meetings produce are known; I order those which have begun on the matter of my edicts to cease. M. first president, I forbid you to allow these assemblies, and I forbid each one of you individually to demand them."

Two serious blows were struck at the parliament. First, a declaration that the decrees of the council of state were binding

on the sovereign courts; and, second, the re-establishment in 1655 of intendants who supervised the provincial administration of justice, and at need annulled the decisions of the *conseil d'en haut*.[1]

The attempted revolution of the parliamentary aristocracy thus proved abortive. A century later, when the parliament attempted a new struggle with absolute power, Lord Chesterfield gave the accurate measure of the strength of this opposition when he remarked to Montesquieu, "Your parliament can make barricades, but it cannot remove barriers."

Victories of Turenne at Arras and the Dunes: Alliance between France and Cromwell.—The war of the *Fronde* was ended; it remained to end the war with Spain. The Spaniards, during the internal troubles of France, had recovered Dunkirk, Barcelona, and Casale in Italy. Condé offered to the enemy that sword which had been so fatal to them, but he seemed to lose his capacity when he left France. He first joined the Archduke Leopold at the siege of Arras, not far from that plain of Lens where he had gained his greatest victory. Turenne attacked the besiegers in their camp and forced their lines, Condé being able only to effect a retreat in good order (August 25, 1654). "I know that all was lost and that you saved all," wrote Philip IV. of Spain to him.

The years 1655 and 1656 were occupied with the sieges of frontier towns, Valenciennes, Cambrai, Rocroi, and with the able manœuvres of Condé and Turenne. But the two generals, with the small armies which they commanded, could strike no decisive blows. Mazarin's monarchical scruples were not stronger than Richelieu's religious scruples. His predecessor had allied with the Protestants against Austria; Mazarin allied with Cromwell—who had caused the son-in-law of Henry IV. to lose his head on the scaffold—against Spain (1657). From that time Spain met with nothing but defeat. While the English conquered Jamaica and burned the galleys of Cadiz, the city of Dunkirk, the key of Flanders, was besieged by land and sea. The Spaniards advanced along the dunes which bordered the sea to relieve it. "Have you ever seen a battle?" Condé asked the young Duke of Gloucester who was placed near him. "No," answered the young prince. "Well," replied Condé, "in half an hour you will see how to lose one." The victory of Turenne was complete (June 14, 1658). Dunkirk was taken, but, according to the terms of the treaty with Cromwell, was handed over to England.

[1] Superior court.

Treaty of the Pyrenees (1658): League of the Rhine (1659).—The cabinet of Madrid had no longer an army and demanded peace. Negotiations were conducted by the two ministers, Mazarin and Don Luis de Haro, who met on the isle of the Conférence, in the Bidassoa, at the foot of the mountains which divided the two countries. This was the Treaty of the Pyrenees, signed November 7, 1658. France retained Artois, Cerdagne, and Roussillon, which Richelieu had conquered; she returned Lorraine to Duke Charles IV. on condition that he should disarm all his strong places, but as he refused to do so the duchy remained in the hands of France. Condé was pardoned and restored to his chief offices. Finally Louis XIV. married the Infanta Maria Theresa, who was to bring him a dower of 500,000 crowns, in consideration of which she renounced all claim to the inheritance of her father.

The conclusion of this marriage had been the aim and hope of Mazarin for fifteen years. As early as 1645 he wrote to his envoys at the Congress of Westphalia, "If the Most Christian King were to marry the Infanta then we might aspire to the succession of Spain whatever renunciation the bride might make, and the possibility would not be remote since only her brother's life stands between her and the throne." In 1659 he arranged that the renunciations should be legally void by making them expressly conditional on the full payment of a dower which he knew that Spain would never be able to pay. A pretext for the claims of the house of Bourbon was thus prepared in advance. But by the same treaty Mazarin abandoned Portugal, which, no longer supported by France, turned to England and all but lost its independence a second time.

While the cardinal meditated the union of Spain and France he also considered that Louis XIV. might possibly be chosen as emperor on the death of Ferdinand III. (1657). Leopold I. was elected; none the less Mazarin concluded the League of the Rhine, by which the three ecclesiastical electors, the Duke of Bavaria, the Princes of Brunswick and Hesse, and the Kings of Sweden and Denmark, united with France to maintain the Treaty of Westphalia, and thus placed themselves to some extent under French protection. The League of the Rhine, an idea which was afterwards adopted and extended by Napoleon under the name of the Confederation of the Rhine, assured France preponderance in the empire. After these great achievements Mazarin was able to declare that "if his language was not French, at least his heart was."

Internal Administration of Mazarin.—In every event, at home and abroad, in contact with the impetuous Condé and with the calm Don Luis de Haro, Mazarin knew to perfection how to steer between difficulties, to turn them aside, and after great repulses and shocks to arrive safely at his end. But once arrived there, and the state with him, he cared only to enjoy the repose which his skill had given him; a great diplomat, he was not a great minister. His internal government was deplorable. He neglected commerce and agriculture; he allowed the navy to decay; he managed finance so that at his death there was a public debt of 430 millions while his private fortune amounted to 100 millions, a sum equal to about four times that figure in modern values, and alluding to which the superintendent, Nicholas Fouquet, remarked to the king, "Sire, there is no money in your coffers, but M. le Cardinal can lend you some." Such was Mazarin's greed in the last years of his life that he was said "to make the whole kingdom pass through his hands that he might give it piece by piece to his nieces and his friends." If Mazarin was in this regard a bad minister he was at least a good relative; if he prevented one of his nieces from marrying Louis XIV. he placed the others in high positions. Signora Martinozzi, his eldest sister, saw one of her daughters become Princess of Conti and another Sovereign-Duchess of Modena. The five daughters of Signora Mancini, his other sister, who arrived from Italy with small belongings, were married to the Duke of Mercœur, the Count of Soissons of the house of Savoy, by whom she became the mother of Eugène; to Colonna, the Constable of the Papal States; to the Duke of Bouillon, and to the Duke of La Meilleraye. France paid dowers for them all. Mazarin's nephew was Duke of Nivernais, and as for his brother, a poor monk hidden in an Italian convent, he was made Archbishop of Aix and a cardinal.

It is impossible to regard as compensation for this pillage some pensions given to men of letters, of whom Ménage supplies the list: to Descartes, who lived in retirement in Holland; to the historian Mézeray, who was granted an annual pension of 4000 francs; nor the expenses incurred for the creation of the magnificent Mazarin library, which was later opened to the public for the convenience and satisfaction of men of letters; nor the foundation of the College of the Four Nations, to which he left 800,000 crowns by will and which he intended to receive those students of the university who belonged to the Spanish, Italian, German, and Flemish provinces lately added to the

kingdom. Mazarin had a keen, if not a well-instructed, taste for the arts; he caused a number of pictures to be brought from Italy as well as statues and curiosities, and even actors and musicians, who introduced the opera into France. He also founded in 1655 the Academy of Painting and Sculpture.

Mazarin died on March 9, 1661, at Vincennes at the age of fifty-nine, in despair at leaving his beautiful paintings, his statues, his books, his affairs of state, and life itself, and yet meeting death bravely.

THIRTEENTH PERIOD—TRIUMPH OF THE ABSOLUTE MONARCHY

(1661–1715)

CHAPTER L

LOUIS XIV.: INTERNAL ORGANISATION: COLBERT, LOUVOIS, VAUBAN (1661–1683)

Divisions of the Reign of Louis XIV. — Charles V. said that fortune does not love old men. Long reigns, indeed, do often present two conflicting aspects, a time of prestige and prosperity and a time of decadence and misery. The fairest period of the reign of Louis XIV. extends from 1661 to 1683, from the death of Mazarin to that of Colbert. It was filled with the deeds of that generation of great men who had been trained in the years preceding it. Internal administration was in the hands of Colbert; war in those of Turenne, Condé, Duquesne, and Louvois. The realm of letters was distinguished by the names of Molière, La Fontaine, Boileau, Racine, Bossuet, Bourdaloue, and Madame de Sévigné. In art there were Lebrun, Claude Lorraine, Puget, Hardouin, Mansart, and Pérrault. All things smiled on the king and supported him; durable conquests were made, great public works were accomplished, and splendid monuments raised.

After 1683, when Louis XIV. had reached the prime of life, his health deteriorated; Louvois was no longer balanced by Colbert, and the king was dominated by Madame de Maintenon. Happiness and good fortune fled with youth. That glorious crown, which the age of Louis XIV. bore so nobly, faded and fell; the great men passed away and were replaced by others of small calibre. Pascal, Molière, and Le Poussin were dead; La Fontaine and Boileau had already produced almost all the works cherished by posterity. Racine was silent and broke that silence only to produce one final masterpiece; Bossuet wrote no more great works. Lebrun was in disgrace; Turenne had been killed; Condé was dead and Duquesne was dying. Louis remained alone, the last survivor of an age which all these illustrious men had honoured, and he went down to his grave sad, defeated, a burden

to himself and to others, leaving France without industry, without commerce, exhausted, and cursing even that great reign which for twenty-five years she had hailed with enthusiastic applause.

Louis XIV. governs personally.—In 1661 Louis XIV. was twenty-three years old and had reigned for eighteen without becoming known to his subjects. Mazarin alone understood him. He had remarked to the Marshals Villeroy and Grammont, "You do not know him; he will set out a little late, but he will travel further than any. He has in him the makings of four kings and one honest man." No one thought that this young prince, who had so far been given over to the amusements of his age, would dare to rule personally, but the correspondence of Mazarin bears witness to the cardinal's constant efforts to prepare his pupil for the conduct of affairs. When, after Mazarin's death, the ministers came to the king to ask to whom they should address themselves in future, Louis answered, "To me." Michel le Tellier, the secretary of state, hastened to make this news known to the queen-mother, who laughed sarcastically and replied, "Well, M. le Tellier, don't you believe him?" But the king's resolution was taken in accordance with the advice of Mazarin; the astonishing thing is, not that it was taken, but that it was kept. Louis accepted all the cares of royalty and, as La Bruyère says, his own chief minister, required all the principal functionaries of the state to correspond directly with himself. For thirty years he worked regularly eight hours a day, and in his *Mémoires* he recalls with pride the effect which this declaration produced, recommending his son in eloquent terms not to forget that "a man reigns by work; that it is ingratitude and presumption towards God, injustice and tyranny towards men, to wish to reign without working."

Theories of Louis XIV. on Government.—It is still more remarkable that this young prince, who so boldly took up the reins of power, had already conceived a complete scheme of policy. Not only did Louis XIV. reign with unlimited power, as some of his predecessors had already done, but he established for the first time in France the conception of the absolute monarchy. In his eyes monarchy was a divine institution; kings were the representatives of God on earth, His lieutenants, providentially inspired by Him, and hence sharing in a measure the power and infallibility of the Deity. And since the monarchy, in making itself absolute, had preserved the old feudal idea of identity of sovereignty and property, Louis believed himself

to be not only the master of his subjects, but also the proprietor of their goods, a monstrous doctrine which descends from the ancient oriental monarchies. This authority, limited only by the royal conscience and by religion, was not to be sterile, but active and hardworking. He believed that kings had imperious duties to fulfil. "We ought," he said, "to consider rather the good of our subjects than our own. It is for their advantage that we should give them laws, and the power which we have over them should be used only for their more effectual betterment. It is more admirable to deserve the name of father than that of master, and if the latter is ours by the fact of birth, the former is the cherished object of our ambition." "Our subjects," he says elsewhere, "are our true wealth. If God gives me grace to do all that I have in mind, I hope to bring the happiness of my reign to such a height that (I will not say that there shall be no more rich and poor, for that distinction is eternally produced among men by fortune, by industry, and by brain) there shall be neither indigence nor beggary in my kingdom, that no one, however wretched he may be, shall not be assured of his daily bread, either through his own toil or through the ordinary and regulated assistance of the state." Such were the ideas of Louis upon the kingly office.

Ministers of Louis XIV. — The ministers left by Mazarin were Pierre Séguier, keeper of the seals and chancellor; Michel le Tellier, secretary of state for war; Hugh de Lionne, in charge of the navy and foreign affairs; and Nicholas Fouquet, superintendent of finances. The first two were distinguished men, the third was a superior man. As for the fourth, Fouquet had acquired a reputation as a generous Maecenas by championing the cause of letters; he counted among his friends some illustrious persons, Pellisson, La Fontaine, Gourville, Madame de Sévigné, and Mademoiselle de Scudéri, who has pleaded his cause with posterity, though without success. Fouquet had left the finances in a state of extreme disorder, and had himself unscrupulously pillaged the treasury, spending nine millions on his château of Vaux and thinking nothing of paying 120,000 livres for a dinner. To the king, he increased the statements of expenditure and diminished those of receipts; he appeared to seek for support everywhere, even among the highest nobles; he fortified the places over which he had control in order to prepare an impregnable refuge for himself in case of disgrace. He was almost a *frondeur;* he was certainly a knave. It was essential that Louis should strike at him.

The king had a secret minister who drew his attention to all the errors and lies of Fouquet. This minister was Jean Baptiste Colbert, born at Reims in 1619 of an old family of merchants and magistrates. Colbert had been Mazarin's intendant, and the cardinal, before his death, had said to the king, "Sire, I owe you everything, but I think that I have in a measure paid my debt by giving you Colbert."

The destruction of Fouquet was perhaps already determined when the court accepted a magnificent fête which he gave at his house of Vaux. Louis XIV. was annoyed at a proud device which he saw everywhere, *Quo non ascendam?* and still more at the truly royal splendour produced to please him. He said angrily to the queen-mother, "Ah, madame, why should not these people be made to refund our money?" And the king was tempted to arrest the minister at Vaux in the midst of the fête which was being given, though he restrained himself. Some weeks after, Fouquet was in the Bastille (September, 1661). He was accused of embezzlement, a charge which was only too true, and of a plot against the state, a charge which was never proved. At the end of three years, nine judges voted for death, thirteen others for banishment. The king chose the heavier penalty, though he commuted it to perpetual imprisonment, and Fouquet was confined in the citadel of Pignerol, where he died after nineteen years of captivity. Colbert succeeded him with the title of controller-general. In 1666 Michel le Tellier left his office to his son, the famous Louvois, and the first ministry of Louis XIV. was completed.

Colbert.—Colbert really directed five ministries: the royal household with the fine arts; the finances; agriculture and commerce; public works; and from 1669 the marine—a crushing burden under which he did not succumb. "Jean Baptiste Colbert," says a contemporary, "had a naturally frowning countenance. His deep-set eyes, his thick dark eyebrows, gave him an austere appearance and made him seem at first sight savage and forbidding, but when he was better known he was found to be genial, quick, and extraordinarily constant. He was convinced that good faith is the surest basis of policy. Infinite application and an insatiable passion for learning took the place of profound knowledge with him. He was the restorer of the finances, which he found in unspeakable confusion when he assumed office. His mind was solid, though heavy, fitted especially for calculation, and it enabled him to unravel all the details of the perplexing accounts which the superintendents and the

treasurers had produced in order that they might fish in troubled waters." It may be added that this hard and austere financier, "this man of marble," as Gui Patin calls him, had a heart. "It is essential," he wrote to Louis XIV., "to save five shillings on unnecessary matters, and to pour out millions when your glory is concerned. A useless feast, costing 3000 livres, causes me incredible pain, but when it is a question of millions of gold for the Polish affair, I would sell all that I possess, I would hire out my wife and children, I would go on foot to the end of my days to supply them."

Financial Reorganisation.—The finances had fallen into that condition of chaos from which Sully had rescued them under Henry IV. The national debt amounted to 430 millions, the revenue was anticipated for two years, and of 84 millions raised annually by taxation the treasury received hardly 35 millions. Colbert's first step was to create a chamber of justice, in order to discover the malversations committed during the previous twenty-five years by the officers of the finances. Eight millions of *rentes* were annulled instead of being redeemed, as they had been bought at a low price by private individuals; such brokers as had profited from the needs of the state to lend money at usurious rates were forced to disgorge their gains. By fines and confiscations 110 millions were raised, and several brokers were hanged.

Colbert was the true creator of the budget. Hitherto money had been spent at haphazard, without regard for the receipts of the treasury. Now, for the first time, a statement of expected revenue and expenditure was drawn up each year, the *état de prévoyance*.

He modified the character of taxation. The *taille*, or tax on real property, was personal, payable by the commoners; Colbert decided to make it general, as it was in the south, and as it is throughout France at the present day, payable by all owners whether noble or not. The *taille* in 1661 amounted to 53 millions; Colbert reduced it to 32 millions. During the disorders of the *Fronde* many persons had assumed or bought for a mere song titles of nobility, and had secured the privileges attaching to genuine titles. As early as 1662, Molière, in his *École des Femmes*, satirised this vanity which was so expensive to the country at large. A royal ordinance revoked all letters of nobility granted in the last thirty years; Gros-Pierre was called upon to produce title deeds which he did not possess, and almost 40,000 families, among the richest in the various districts, were once more made liable to taxation to the relief of their neighbours.

The controller-general rightly preferred *aides* (indirect taxes), to which all contributed, to the *taille*. He reduced the price of salt, a commodity which was a prime necessity to the poor, but increased or created taxes on coffee, tobacco, wine, playing cards, lotteries, and so forth, and thus raised the revenue from indirect taxation from 1,500,000 livres to 21,000,000. His indirect taxes, some of which have been severely criticised by modern writers, originated from a sense of justice and equality.

Colbert disliked loans, not because he was blind to the advantage of borrowing at a low interest to liquidate onerous charges, but because he doubted the advisability of enabling Louis XIV. to burden the future to the profit of the present. As he left the council, at which the raising of the first loan was decided in 1672, he bitterly reproached Lamoignon for having approved of the measure. "Do you know, as I know, the type of man with whom we have to deal, his passion for display, for great undertakings, for every kind of expenditure? Once the door is opened to him to borrow there will be no limit to expenditure and hence to taxation. You will have to answer to the nation and to posterity." A time came, indeed, after the death of Colbert, when Louis XIV. borrowed at 400 per cent. The great minister at least attempted to defend the state from the exactions of the financiers by inviting the small capitalists to invest directly, without the employment of middlemen, in a bureau of loans which he created for this purpose and to which money flowed. This scheme was revived in more modern times.

A résumé of the general financial administration of Colbert is as follows: In 1661 on 84 million livres of taxes the state paid 52 millions in interest and salaries; there remained 32 millions, while the expenditure amounted to 60 millions, leaving a deficit of 28 millions. In 1683, the year of Colbert's death, the taxes produced 112 millions, despite a reduction of 22 millions in the *taille;* salaries and interest amounted to only 23 millions and the net revenue was 89 millions. Thus Colbert had increased receipts by 28 millions, reduced salaries and interest by 29 millions, and secured for the state a net gain of 57 millions per annum. At the same time he had relieved the commons of 22 millions of taxes, by reducing the *taille* by that amount. These figures speak for themselves.

Agriculture.—Sully had sacrificed industry to agriculture; Colbert did not sacrifice agriculture to industry as has been sometimes said. He reduced the burdens upon agriculture; he exempted large families from the *taille;* he again forbade the

seizure of the instruments of labour and beasts for the recovery of taxes due to the state. He established, or rather restored, studs, where French horses were crossed with an African and Danish strain. He imported animals from Germany and Switzerland to improve the French stock, and sheep from England for the same purpose. He granted bounties to encourage the best breeders. He ordered the draining of marshes and finally published (1669) a code for rivers and forests, much of which is still in force. But he was guilty of respecting the popular prejudice which found the cause of famine in the export of grain, instead of adopting, as Turgot and the Constituent Assembly did a hundred years later, the best means of preventing scarcity, the permission for the free circulation of corn in all parts of the country. Colbert succeeded in keeping down the price of corn for the sake of the manufacturing population and the soldiers, but as cultivation was unprofitable much land went out of cultivation. Waste land increased; famines became more numerous, and as early as May, 1675, the Governor of Dauphiné wrote to Colbert that the inhabitants of the rural districts had lived all the winter on bread made of chaff and roots, and that he had seen them eating herbs and the bark of trees.

Industry.—Industry, in the sense of manufactures, had been introduced into France under Francis I. and Henry IV.; it was still in its infancy, all important articles coming from abroad. Italy supplied France with woven goods, glass, and jewellery; Germany with fine china and Bohemian crystal; Flanders with lace and tapestry; Holland with cloth and linen; England with woollen goods and steel. Colbert, who was born in a merchant's shop at Reims at the sign of *Long-Vêtu*, desired France to become self-supporting, and to give French industry time to grow, he adopted a salutary protective system. He was rather the organiser than the originator of protective duties, which injure an industry once developed, but are indispensable to a nascent industry. If he laid heavy duties by the tariff of 1667 on all goods coming from abroad which could be produced in France, this was in his view only a temporary measure, intended to enable the kingdom to demand from the foreigner those commodities which were necessary to her. He himself told the king that these duties should be reduced in order to facilitate the exportation of French products and the importation of raw material. Thanks to the lavish expenditure of Colbert in the purchase or suppression of the industrial secrets of other nations and in attracting to France the ablest workers, French manu-

factures rapidly increased. They were supported by subventions, distributed wisely, a certain sum being advanced to each trade, in addition to considerable bounties to masters and workmen. Colbert secured from the Church the suppression of seventeen festivals which multiplied useless holidays. He also increased the number of workers, as Richelieu had attempted to do, by reducing the number of monks and by postponing to the age of twenty-five permission to take religious vows. He instituted councils of arbitrators to maintain peace in the manufacturing world.

In 1669, 42,220 looms and more than 60,000 workers were engaged in the wool trade alone. The draperies of Sedan, Louviers, Abbeville, and Elbeuf were unrivalled in Europe; tinplates, steel, china, Morocco leather, which had always been imported from abroad, were now manufactured in France; the cloth and serge of Holland, the point lace and velour of Genoa were imitated and equalled in France; Persian and Turkish carpets were surpassed at La Savonnerie, Ambusson, and Beauvais; rich stuffs or silk, woven with gold and silver, were produced at Tours and Lyons; at Tour la Ville, near Cherbourg, and at Paris glass was made which surpassed that of Venice; the tapestry of Flanders gave place to that of the Gobelins. This last manufacture employed, from 1662, more than 800 workmen; the best artists directed the work, supplying either their own designs or imitating those of the old Italian masters. Lebrun presided over the work for twenty-eight years, and Mignard succeeded him. This unexpected flight of French industry was admirable; Boileau, writing history when he believed that he was only writing poetry, said justly in his epistle to the king (1669):—

> "Nos artisans grossiers rendus industrieux
> Et nos voisins frustrés de ces tributs serviles
> Que payait à leur art le luxe de nos villes."

It may be noted that Colbert gave French industry that impress which it has always borne since his time. He was not concerned merely to increase production; he desired that production should be good. It seems he understood the place which France could occupy in the industrial world, her task of applying a lively imagination and a delicate taste to work upon raw materials. In accordance with this idea the manufactory of the Gobelins was organised as a great model school, where art and industry should for ever be associated, the one giving beauty and grace, the other utility.

Internal Trade: Public Works.—In order to facilitate communication between the various towns and provinces, Colbert was anxious that there should be customs barriers on the frontier alone. He found such barriers existing between every province, and though he was unable to destroy the numerous toll-houses on the roads and rivers he at least reduced their number, suppressing interior customs houses in twelve provinces. By reducing the rate of duties payable, he encouraged the export of wine and brandy (1664); he declared Dunkirk, Bayonne, and Marseilles free ports, and granted Marseilles a chamber of assurance (1670). He established in the ports warehouses at which duties remitted on re-exportation were repaid; he favoured the transit through France of foreign merchandise, which might pass freely through all the provinces; he repaired such main roads as had fallen into decay and built new highways. The canal of Burgundy was projected by him; that of Orleans, opened in 1692, was decreed; and that of Languedoc, to unite the Mediterranean and the Atlantic, was dug. At one end of this canal the port of Cette was constructed; Toulouse was at its other end and from Toulouse the Garonne afforded ready communication with Bordeaux and the Atlantic. This work, vast for the period, was begun in 1664 and continued without interruption until 1681. It was executed by the celebrated Riquet, of an old Florentine family, according to the designs of a French engineer, Andréossy; it cost 34 million livres and employed every year ten or twelve thousand labourers.

Commerce, with such assistance, made rapid strides. To regulate and watch over this new activity, Colbert restored in 1665 the council of commerce founded by Henry IV. Louis XIV. presided regularly over it once a fortnight. Similar councils established in the provinces were to meet annually on June 20 to examine the state of commerce and manufactures, and to appoint deputies who should bring their opinions to the notice of the minister. An ordinance of 1671, which unfortunately remained a dead letter, established uniform weights and measures in all ports; they actually became uniform in the arsenals.

Foreign Commerce and Colonies.—"Foreigners," says an edict of 1664, "have made themselves masters of all sea-borne commerce, even that between different ports of the kingdom." Every year 4000 Dutch vessels landed the products of their industry, especially cloth, on the French coast, with the goods of two worlds, and carried away French silks, wines, and spirits.

Colbert wished to rescue France from this position of inferiority. He wrote (March 21, 1669) to Arnold de Pomponne, ambassador at the Hague, "The sea-borne commerce of Europe employs some 25,000 vessels; in the natural order of things, each nation would possess a share of this tonnage proportionate to its power, population, and the extent of its coasts. But the Dutch have from 15,000 to 16,000 ships, the French five or six hundred at most, and the king will therefore use every endeavour to approach more nearly that number of ships which ought to be owned by his subjects." As early as 1659 the superintendent Fouquet had established an anchorage due of fifty sous per ton, payable on entering and leaving a port, for foreign vessels; Colbert maintained this duty, which did for the French merchant navy what the Navigation Act did for the English. He granted French ships bounties on export and import, and encouraged the building of ships for ocean commerce by another bounty of from four to six livres per ton, with the result that the French mercantile marine, being at once protected and stimulated, developed.

The English and Dutch still had the advantage of long experience, of safe harbours, of markets which they had frequented for a century, and of vast capital which permitted them to dare and risk much. Colbert, to contend with them, substituted privileged associations for private effort. He established five great companies on the model of those of England and Holland: those of the East Indies and West Indies in 1554; those of the North and the Levant in 1666; and that of Senegal in 1673. To them he gave the exclusive monopoly of trade in these distant lands, with premiums, and lent to them considerable sums of money—6,000,000 to the East Indies Company alone. He also obliged the princes of the blood, the nobles, and the rich to interest themselves in these companies, and finally declared by an edict of 1669 that to engage in maritime commerce was not derogatory for a noble. At the same time consuls and ambassadors received orders to give the most active protection to commerce, an order often renewed, and to furnish all useful information.

Colbert also desired to revive the colonial system, neglected since the time of Richelieu. France possessed only Canada, with Acadia, Cayenne, the Isle of Bourbon, and some factories in Madagascar and the Indies. Colbert bought for less than a million Martinique, Guadeloupe, St. Lucia, Grenada and the Grenadines, Marie-Galante, St. Martin, St. Christopher, St. Bartholomew, St. Croix, and Tortuga in the Lesser Antilles

(1665). He placed under the protection of France the pirates of San Domingo, who had seized the western part of that island (1664); he sent new colonists to Cayenne (1677) and to Canada (1665); he occupied Terra Nova in order to command the entrance to the St. Lawrence (1680), and began the occupation of the magnificent valley of the Mississippi, or Louisiana, which was explored by a bold captain, Robert de la Salle (1680). In Africa, he took Goree in Senegal from the Dutch (1665) and seized the eastern coasts of Madagascar. In Asia, the Indian company established itself at Surat, Chandernagore, and later at Pondicherry. In order to reserve for the national flag all colonial commerce, Colbert closed their ports to all foreign vessels, and to develop their cultivation he forbade in 1667 the importation into France of the tobacco and sugar of Brazil, an unfortunate measure which alienated Portugal and threw her into the arms of England.

The Navy.—The merchant marine is at once the training ground and the nursery of the navy; if the first is flourishing the second will become formidable. Colbert first refitted the few ships left in the ports of France by Mazarin; he bought others in Sweden and Holland, while dockyards were constructed at Dunkirk, Havre, and Rochefort, the last being built on the Charente at the centre of the Bay of Biscay. Henry IV. had founded Toulon, Richelieu had founded Brest, but they had rather indicated the possibilities of those ports than made them great. Duquesne remained seven years at Brest from 1665, and when Seignelay, Colbert's son, went there in 1672 he found a fleet of fifty vessels of the line. After the Peace of Nimwegen he executed vast works at Toulon, which made that city what nature had intended it to be, one of the finest ports in the world. The new dock constructed there was capable of containing a hundred ships of the line.

To man the fleet, Colbert created the *inscription maritime*, by which the population of the French coasts was compelled, in return for certain advantages, to furnish the recruits needed for the equipment of the navy, and by which those recruits were distributed, according to age and family position, in different classes which were called up in succession as the needs of the service demanded. This institution was completed by the creation of the bureau of veterans, by which a pension was secured for the retired sailor in his old age. The first census, that of 1670, showed that 36,000 sailors had been enrolled, but in 1683 the number had risen to 77,852. Armaments were also increased.

In 1661, the navy consisted of only 30 ships; in 1678 it consisted of 120, and five years later of 176. In 1692 the king had 131 vessels of the line, 133 frigates, and 101 other ships. Intendants at Rochefort for the Atlantic station and at Toulon for the Mediterranean looked after the maintenance of this vast material. The administration of the navy was divided from that of the army, with benefit to both services. The corps of marine guards composed of 1000 gentlemen was established in 1672 to act as a school of good officers, and at the same time there were created a school of gunnery, to furnish good marksmen, and a school of hydrography, from which the navy secured accurate charts.

Fine Arts.—Colbert had reformed finance, commerce, and navigation by giving them a minute regulation which too frequently substituted the initiative of government for that of the individual. He wished also to regulate thought, to place the moral life of France under the control of the king, as Richelieu had placed the political life, as Colbert himself placed the material life of the country. A great admirer of the cardinal, he resumed his design of constituting a government of literature. In 1663 he created the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-lettres; in 1666 that of Sciences, which gave to the researches of scholars that which they had hitherto lacked, a centre and a home. The Academy of Music was organised in the same year, and that of Architecture in 1671. A school of fine arts, established at Rome in 1667, received pupils who had gained the prize of the Academy of Painting at Paris, and who copied on canvas or in marble the masterpieces of antiquity. The cabinet of medals and the school of *jeunes-de-langue* for the study of oriental languages were founded; the library was increased by more than 10,000 volumes and by a large number of valuable manuscripts; the Mazarin library was opened to the public; the *Jardin-des-Plants* was extended, and the creation of provincial academies was encouraged. These excellent foundations were full of hope for the future. In the present, artists and men of letters already found their reward in them, in the honour of being included in the number of their associates and in the profits which accrued from such a position. Louis gave them individually more considerable advantages. Corneille, Racine, Boileau, Molière, Quinault, Lulli, and twenty more received pensions; even foreigners shared in his liberality. "Though the king is not your sovereign," wrote Colbert to them, "he wishes to be your benefactor; he commands me to send you the letter attached

as a pledge of his esteem." Among these men may be noted the librarian of the Vatican, Allacci; Count Graziani, secretary to the Duke of Modena; Vossius, the historian of the United Provinces; the Dane Roemer; the Dutchman Huygens, whom Colbert summoned to Paris where he remained fifteen years; and many others. Viviani, the celebrated mathematician of Florence, caused a house to be built with this inscription in letters of gold, *Aedes a Deo datae*. Admiration for Louis passed the French frontiers; a dozen panegyrics in his honour were declaimed in different cities of Italy. It must be added that this admiration was bought cheaply, the budget of literature was never heavy. In the year in which the pensions reached their highest figure the total expenditure did not exceed 100,000 livres, 53,000 of which was for Frenchmen, 16,000 for foreigners, and the balance for presents. The average was 75,000 livres.

Louvois: Reform of the Army.—Colbert had organised peace; Louvois, "the greatest and most brutal of commissaries," organised war. Francis Michel le Tellier, Marquis de Louvois, was born in 1641, and at the age of fifteen entered the office of his father, then secretary of state. He had been trained by a long apprenticeship in the art of administration, in which he showed a degree of activity equal to that of Colbert. When Louis XIV. decided to rule personally, Louvois became the real minister of war, though he only succeeded his father in 1666. He reformed the army, and his reforms lasted as long as the French monarchy. If he maintained the system of voluntary enlistment, which had been practised for three centuries, he reduced the abuses and dangers of the system by strict discipline and severe regulations. He established the French uniform by ordering that each regiment should be distinguished by the colour of its coats and by different marks (1670). He introduced the use of pontoons of hides for crossing rivers; he instituted stores of food and provisions, canteens, military hospitals, the Hôtel des Invalides—all things which had been little known before him. He created the corps of engineers, whence the great Vauban got his best pupils; he created schools of artillery at Douai, Metz, and Strasburg; companies of infantry, grenadiers, regiments of hussars, and companies of cadets, the latter military academies for gentlemen.

The army still felt itself to be feudal. The cavalry had too much importance and the nobles did not care to serve in any other arm. "I declared," says Louis XIV., "that I would give

no employment in the cavalry in future to those who had not served in the infantry." Battles were begun or completed by the one arm, gained by the other. From this time the French infantry became, and remained, except under Louis XV., the finest in the world. Louvois regulated the march and substituted for the pikes, which still prevailed, the musket and bayonet, but it was only when Vauban made the musket a weapon for close quarters as well as for distant fighting that it became the most formidable weapon of destruction that had yet been put into the hands of man.

Louvois made a revolution in the army by the *ordre-de-tableau* and by the creation of inspections. He did not destroy the venality of commissions, which had been introduced into the army and which was used only for the profit of the nobles, but to merit promotion it was no longer enough to possess ancestors, it was necessary also to have a record of service, and from the rank of colonel promotion depended on seniority. The nobles hated this minister, "Who had humbled men born to command others on the pretext that it was reasonable to learn to obey before being placed in command, and who wished to make the nobles accustomed to equality and to mingling with every one." Louvois, with inflexible firmness, required that all should do their duty, and to insure that they did so, he instituted inspectors-general who went everywhere as representatives of the authority of the king and his minister. Severe blame fell upon officers who were negligent, like the colonel of good family mentioned by Madame de Sévigné. "Louvois said very loudly the other day to Monsieur de Nogaret, 'Sir, your company is in a very bad state.' 'Sir, I was not aware of it.' 'You ought to know it,' said Monsieur de Louvois, 'have you seen it?' 'No, sir,' replied Nogaret. 'You must see it, sir.' 'Sir, I will give an order.' 'It must be given: for, sir, you must decide whether you will be a courtier or an officer, and do your duty as such." Louvois created the *camps-de-plaisance*, a ruinous innovation when these assemblies of troops were no more than a spectacle to amuse the ladies of the court and relieve the king from boredom, but an excellent school for officers and generals when they prepared seriously for the great manœuvres of war. Only after his death was the Order of St. Louis instituted, designed to pay for military services by honours. In this order there was no distinction of birth, but there was a religious bar, the Protestants being excluded. By such methods France was able in the war of Flanders to place 125,000 men in the field; in the

war with Holland, 180,000; before Ryswick, 300,000; and 450,000 in the War of the Spanish Succession.

Fortification of the Frontiers: Vauban.—There was one point alone on which the minister of war and the minister of marine were agreed, the fortification of the realm. For the accomplishment of this vast work, they found a man who shares with Colbert himself the position of the greatest man of the reign, Le Prestre de Vauban. He was a man of humble family born near Saulieu in Burgundy (1633). His father died on active service, leaving him nothing, and he was received and educated by a neighbouring priest. At the age of seventeen, he found himself in the midst of the *Fronde*, eleven of his brothers, uncles, and relatives being under arms. One morning Vauban escaped and hastened to join the great Condé, who received him as a cadet, and soon made him an officer. The priest had given him some idea of geometry, and this Vauban developed; these facts decided his profession. Entering the royal army, he served under the Chevalier de Clerville, the most famous French engineer of the time, and at the age of twenty-five directed the sieges of Gravelines, Ypres, and Oudenarde. In 1663 his reputation was great enough for Louis XIV. to employ him to fortify Dunkirk, and this first work of the young engineer was a masterpiece. Two jetties extending 2000 metres into the sea, and being defended by formidable batteries, created a port where nature had made only an inferior anchorage. The waters from the land and those of the sea, directed with skill, served to create a great flow of water which constantly bored a channel and carried out to sea the sand and mud which they had moved. From this time Vauban was the indispensable man whom all generals required when a siege was to be undertaken. During wartime, Vauban captured towns; in time of peace, he fortified them. It is calculated that he worked at three hundred formerly fortified places, constructed thirty-two new fortresses, conducted fifty-three sieges, and was engaged in a hundred and forty pitched battles. He was many times wounded, since, in order to reconnoitre the approaches of a place and spare the blood of his soldiers, he exposed himself in a fashion which would have laid him open to the charge of rashness had it not been that his conduct was the result of a cool and reflective courage which made such actions a matter of duty.

Situated between two seas, defended by the Pyrenees, the Alps, and the Jura, and by the Rhine from Basle to Landau, France only lacked a natural frontier from the Rhine to Dunkirk on the

north-east. This barrier, which nature or rather policy had denied her, Vauban supplied. He fortified Dunkirk, whence sallied so many bold corsairs that the enemy had to keep the port continually blockaded by thirty or forty ships. Vauban fortified Lille, Metz, and Strasburg, when that place came into the hands of France. He built Maubeuge on the Sambre, repaired Charlemont on the Meuse, and relied on these two places with Philippeville to cover Picardy and the valley of the Oise, which descends towards Paris. By means of Longwy, built opposite Luxemburg, he closed the opening of the Ardennes between the Meuse and the Moselle. The valley of the Moselle was the great route for invasions of France from Germany; Vauban doubled the strength of Metz and constructed Thionville as an additional work. He built Saarlouis in the midst of the large gap which extends from the Moselle to the Vosges, in order to cover Lorraine, though that province was not yet French. Bitche and Phalsbourg became the chief defences of the Vosges; Landau, that of Alsace, and that recently conquered province was bound to France by means of Lichtemberg, Hagenau, Schelestadt, Huningue, Neu-Breisgau, and above all by Strasburg. The Vosges do not join the Jura, and in the resulting gap in the defences of France Vauban raised Belfort. He added new works to Besançon, the guardian of the frontier of the Jura, and to Briançon, which covered the basin of the Durance, while Mont Dauphin was built almost on the summit of the Alps. Little attention had been paid to the defences of the Pyrenees, which offered two passages for armies on the side of Bayonne and on that of Perpignan. Vauban made these two places the centre alike of defence and offence, while he placed in the midst of the mountains, St. Jean-pied-de-Port before the first, Mont Louis before the second.

He constantly visited the coasts and left everywhere traces of his visits. He worked at Antibes, the large and safe port of which is unfortunately shallow and difficult of access. He transformed Toulon, which had definitely become the great French port on the Mediterranean, as Marseilles was unable to admit the vessels of deep draught which had replaced the galleys. He wished to make another great naval port at Port Vendres, at the entrance of the Gulf of Lyons. He constructed the fort of Andaye on the Bay of Biscay to defend the mouth of the Bidassoa; also the citadel of Bayonne, though he did nothing to improve the dangerous passage of the Adour. The mouth of the Gironde was already guarded by the little island

of Pate, Fort Médoc, and the citadel of Blaye, which crossed their fire over the river; these defences were enough. The Chevalier de Clerville was responsible for the fortification of the Charente and the foundation of Rochefort, but Vauban restored the walls of La Rochelle on a new plan, built the citadel on the Isle of Ré, and fortified Brest. The importance of St. Malo was of too ancient a date for that nest of corsairs not to have been long since protected by imposing fortifications, and one of the towers of the old castle bears an inscription of the Duchesse Anne, "Qui qu'en grogne, ainsi dira, c'est mon plaisir." The pleasure of these hardy mariners was to fall upon the English as soon as war was declared. Vauban recognised the excellent position of Cherbourg on the peninsula of the Cotentin, which juts out like a spur into the Channel, but after some works there, he abandoned his plans, which were not carried out until the reign of Louis XVI. The attempts to free Le Havre from the bar which threatened to close the port were no better executed. Dieppe and St. Valery-sur-Somme had no need of new works. Boulogne received some new fortifications. Vauban wished to work at Calais, but was only permitted to carry out his ideas for the deepening of the harbour; there was some fear that injury would be done to Dunkirk, the favourite of Louis XIV., and the deserved favourite.

Vauban, who knew so well how to fortify towns, knew still better how to reduce them. The use of shells to destroy earthworks, of ricochet fire to dismount the enemy's pieces and to destroy bastions, and above all the invention of parallels, which he devised at the siege of Maestricht in 1673 to unite the trenches which converged on the place, restored to the attack the advantage over the defence. Vauban advanced slowly but surely, marching under cover by lines always well connected with each other and mutually supporting, never storming when he could avoid that method, sparing his soldiers, whose lives had before his time been wasted, and attaining his object with infinitely more speed and with less danger, because he first silenced the fire of the enemy and never left them a single tenable point on their ramparts or a single piece of artillery which could be used. The impregnable fortress became a thing of the past and Vauban was easily able to calculate beforehand when a besieged town would be taken. He was also the inventor of the socket which enabled the infantry to fire while keeping their bayonets fixed.

Vauban made many tours of the frontiers and coasts to examine all fortified places, but he also considered commercial

centres. He made many military plans, but he also made plans designed to aid agriculture and the arts of peace. He pointed out harbours and canals which should be dug, jetties and piers to be built; he indicated the means by which the navigation of the rivers might be improved. Colbert himself did not love his country more than did this great citizen, for whom St. Simon invented the title of "patriot." What Vauban accomplished in this regard was nothing to what he wished to accomplish, and his *Mémoires* are at the present day still full of useful ideas.

Séguier: Great Legislative Works.—In a memorandum presented to the king on May 15, 1655, Colbert proposed so to reorganise legislation that France should have one law; one system of weights, and one system of measures; he further advocated free justice; the abolition of the venality of offices at a cost of 420 millions; a reduction in the number of monks; and the encouragement of useful professions. A commission was appointed, consisting of councillors of state and masters of requests, Pontchartrain, Chamillart, Voisin, d'Aligre, Boucherat, and Colbert's uncle, Pussort, "that wooden faggot which was always at the head of all the greatest affairs in the kingdom." Having completed their work, they discussed results with the chief members of the parliament, in the presence of the ministers and under the presidency of the chancellor, or, on occasion, of the king himself. Six codes were published as a result of these deliberations. In 1667 the *Ordonnance Civile*, or *Code Louis*, was produced, which abolished various iniquitous judicial procedures, relics of the Middle Ages, "monuments of human imbecility," says Montaigne. Others were modified in order to expedite justice; the form of the register of civil status was regulated, and it was decreed that these registers should be deposited in the archives of each tribunal. In 1669 came the ordinance of waters and forests; in 1670, the *Ordonnance d'instruction criminelle* by which the use of torture was limited. The accused in capital cases was still denied any counsel or defender, preliminary punishments were retained in the shape of torture to produce confession, and the penalty was still ill-suited to the offence. In 1673 came the commercial code, a true title of fame for Colbert; in 1681 the code of the marine and colonies, on which the common law of Europe was based; in 1685 the *Code Noir*, by which the condition of the negroes in the colonies was regulated. These ordinances together constituted the greatest legislative work accomplished between the period of Justinian and that of Napoleon. In order to secure the observation of the laws,

masters of request were constantly sent through the country, into the provinces, and to the local parliaments, as *enquesteurs* had been under St. Louis.

De Lionne: Foreign and Diplomatic Affairs.—Colbert and Louvois enabled Louis XIV. to wage war with success by the reform of the finances, the creation of a navy, and the reorganisation of the army. De Lionne, secretary of state for foreign affairs, prepared the road to success by his negotiations. He had, according to Choisy, a superior genius; his mind, naturally lively and penetrating, was sharpened by early training in affairs under the cardinal. St. Simon, who was not inclined to flatter him, admits that de Lionne had an ability and superiority out of the common. The king himself supervised all his services; he wrote in person the chief despatches to his ambassadors; he minuted many important letters with his own hand, and all instructions sent in his name were read over to him.

CHAPTER LI

EXTERNAL HISTORY AND CONQUESTS OF LOUIS XIV. (1661–1679)

State of Europe in 1661.—Louis XIV. possessed able ministers, the most united and best-situated kingdom in Europe, an authority which, after the *Fronde*, was freed from the smallest trace of opposition, finances set in good order by Colbert, an army organised by Louvois under the most famous generals, and behind this army a brave nation of 20 million. His strength was great, and was relatively the greater owing to the weakness of his neighbours. Spain had reached that profound decadence towards which the vast ambition of Philip II. had precipitated her, and her actual ruler, Philip IV. (1621–1665), had lost Catalonia and the kingdom of Naples for some years, and Artois, Cerdagne, Roussillon, and Portugal in perpetuity. Germany, divided into over 360 states, all of which had become practically independent as a result of the Treaties of Westphalia, was in a condition of chaos from which Louis XIV. prevented her from emerging by means of the League of the Rhine. Austria, governed by a mediocre prince, Leopold I. (1657–1705), was devoid of credit in the empire, and was sufficiently occupied with her own defence against the Turks. Italy had been of no political weight for two hundred years. Sweden, worn out by the heroic efforts of the great Gustavus, had completed her own exhaustion by her

wars against the Danes, Russians, and Poles. The English had received back the Stuart dynasty, whose opposition to national sentiment neutralised the influence and retarded the development of the country for twenty-five years. Finally, Holland, though rich and powerful at sea, lacked territory, and hence staying power. Louis XIV., surveying Europe at the moment when he assumed the government, saw neither king nor people capable of entering into competition with himself and France, and the earliest acts of his foreign policy revealed a desire for grandeur, a sense of his own dignity, and a degree of pride which were astonishing, but which were justified by success.

First Acts of the Foreign Policy of Louis XIV.—The French ambassador in London, Count d'Estrades, was insulted by the servants of the Spanish ambassador, Baron de Vatteville, at a public ceremony on a matter of precedence. On hearing the news, Louis recalled the envoy whom he had sent to Madrid, sent away the Spanish representative at Paris, and threatened his father-in-law with war if he refused to give open reparation. Philip IV. (1662) gave way, and the Count of Fuentes declared on his behalf at Fontainebleau, in the presence of the court and of the foreign envoys, "That the Spanish ministers would not henceforth claim equality with those of France."

At Rome, the Duke of Créqui, the French ambassador, offended the people by his pride; shots were fired one day at the carriage of the duchess and at the windows of the embassy. Louis demanded satisfaction. As the pope temporised, he seized Avignon and talked of sending an army into Italy. Alexander VII. humbled himself; he erected in the centre of Rome a pillar to serve as a monument of the injury and its reparation, and his nephew, Cardinal Chigi, presented the pontifical excuses to this young prince who had not yet drawn a sword (1664).

Portugal defended its independence against the Spaniards with difficulty, but 4000 veterans under Marshal Schomberg established the house of Braganza on the throne by the victory of Villa Viciosa (1665).

The Barbary pirates infested the Mediterranean. Louis constituted himself the protector of all the nations bordering on and navigating that sea, and his admiral, the Duke of Beaufort, the former *roi des halles*, with a force of fifteen ships, defeated the pirates, burned their bases of Algiers and Tunis, and forced them to respect the name of France and the commerce of the Christians (1665). This war was marked by one heroic deed. Among the prisoners of the Dey of Algiers was an officer of St. Malo, Porcon

de la Barbinais. He was sent to bear peace proposals to the king, having sworn to return if the negotiations failed, 600 Christian captives answering for his word. The proposals were not accepted, as Porcon had foreseen; he went to St. Malo, set his affairs in order, and returned to Algiers, assured of the fate which awaited him. He was executed, a second Regulus, though his name is unknown to fame.

The king had made trial of his young navy in the Mediterranean; he bought for it a port in the northern sea. The new King of England, Charles II., always in need of money, sold him Dunkirk for 5 million francs (1662). The harbour was rapidly deepened, the town was surrounded with formidable fortifications, and it became a cause of regret, envy, and terror to the English. When war broke out between England and the Dutch, Louis joined the latter, but was careful not to risk his fleet seriously, his desire being only to exhibit the capacity of the best sailors in the world and to secure a field for serious manœuvres, which should be still without danger. By the Treaty of Breda (January 2, 1667), England restored Acadia which she had conquered.

In 1664 the Turks threatened Vienna; 6000 men whom Louis sent to the emperor played an important part in the victory of St. Gothard which saved Austria. Louis also aided the Venetians in the defence of Candia, and between 1645 and 1669 more than 50,000 French went there on various occasions. Their last leader, the Duke of Beaufort, died at Candia. This help lent to the enemies of the Ottomans seemed glorious, but was a variation of the secular policy of France. Louis, who thus ran the risk of a rupture with the old ally of Francis I. and Henry IV., soon abandoned another part of their policy, the alliance with the Protestants. He resumed the rôle of Charles V. and Philip II. as the armed chief of Catholicism and absolute monarchy; he aimed, as they had done, at predominance in Europe, and this ambition was as disastrous for France as it had been for Spain.

War of Flanders (1667): The Law of Devolution.—The death of the King of Spain in 1665 was the cause of the first war of Louis XIV. Philip IV. left only one son, a child of four years, Charles II., the issue of his second marriage. The Infanta Maria Theresa, who for six years had been Queen of France, was born of the first marriage. According to a custom in the Low Countries the paternal heritage was given or devolved upon the children of a first, to the exclusion of those of a second, marriage. Louis XIV. accordingly demanded these provinces in the name of his wife. The court of Spain consulted lawyers and theologians

when it should have raised an army; it contended that the law of devolution was a civil custom which could not be applied to political succession, and that as far as the Infanta was concerned, she had renounced at her marriage all claims to her father's inheritance. The French government answered that this renunciation was null on the ground that Maria Theresa was a minor when her father had exacted the renunciation, and that the dower which had not been paid was an essential part of the contract. They further contended that the Low Countries were the personal inheritance of the Kings of Spain and thus should be regulated, as were private domains, by the law of devolution. The first ground had some appearance of soundness; the second was not even specious. But the King of France relied rather on arms than upon arguments.

Spain was then without a fleet, without an army, without money. The land which had sent 100 ships to Lepanto and 165 against England in 1588 was reduced to borrow vessels from the Genoese to carry on her trade with the New World. After having possessed the most formidable armies on the continent, she was only able to place 200,000 effectives on foot. She was forced to have recourse to loans to defend herself and to subsist. She had no longer any commerce; the manufactures of Seville and Segovia were largely ruined; agriculture was decayed; and the population, which had amounted to 20,000,000 under the Arabs, had fallen to 6,000,000. In order to prevent help reaching Spain from abroad, Louis XIV. secured the neutrality of England and the United Provinces, persuaded the princes of the League of the Rhine to furnish him with troops, and even won over the emperor on whom Spain had counted.

The war was a military promenade rather than an invasion. The king entered Flanders with Turenne and 50,000 men (1667); Charleroi, Tournai, Furnes, Courtrai, Douai, and Lille were quickly taken, the last alone making any resistance and checking the French for seventeen days. The Count of Bruay commanded the place; Castilian politeness was then celebrated. As soon as the commandant knew that Louis XIV. was before the walls, he sent to beg the king not to be offended that he should defend the place to the last extremity. He offered to send from the town all that was needed for the service of the royal household and promised that he would not fire upon the side which his majesty might select for his quarters. Louis answered that the whole camp would be his quarters. In three months the whole province was subdued.

At the approach of winter, an armistice was proposed to the Spaniards, but the Governor of the Low Countries, Castel-Rodrigo, repulsed the overtures with contempt, declaring that the projected cessation of hostilities would be granted by nature and that there was no need to receive it as a favour from the enemy. This show of pride, which should have been supported by imposing forces, was punished by the loss of further territory.

"The amusements of St. Germain were in full swing," says Voltaire, "when in the midst of winter, in January, 1668, men were astonished to see troops marching on all sides and gathering in the Three Bishoprics, along the roads of Champagne. Trains of artillery, waggons of munitions, were collected on various pretexts on the road which led from Champagne to Burgundy. The district of France which was full of these movements was ignorant of the cause. Strangers from interest and the courtiers from curiosity made all manner of conjectures; Germany was alarmed; the object of these preparations and of these unusual marches was unknown to every one. No secret of conspirators was better kept than was this plan of Louis XIV. Finally on February 2 the king left St. Germain with the young Duke d'Enghien, son of the great Condé, and some courtiers; the other officers were already with the troops. He rode on horseback for long marches and reached Dijon. On the same day 20,000 men who had assembled by twenty different routes found themselves in Franche-Comté, some leagues from Besançon, and the great Condé appeared at their head." Besançon, Salins, and Dôle capitulated; Franche-Comté was subdued in six weeks, and the Spanish council wrote to the governor that "the King of France need only have sent his lacqueys to take possession of the country instead of going in person."

These rapid successes disturbed the neighbouring states and especially Holland, which in five days concluded with England and Sweden the Triple Alliance of the Hague, which offered its mediation to France and imposed it on Spain. Turenne and Condé wished to disregard the allies and promised the conquest of the Low Countries before the end of the campaign. They had reason for their confidence, since none of the three mediating powers was ready for war. Holland had no army, a few crowns would have bought off Sweden, and the English ships could not have stopped a French advance to Brussels. Louis XIV. on this occasion lacked daring. The King of Spain seemed to be on the point of death and he had no heir. The emperor and the King of France, in view of this expected event, agreed on a partition

of the Spanish monarchy. Louis said that it was useless to fight for some towns when he was about to receive an empire, and signed the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle (May 2, 1668), by which he restored Franche-Comté and retained only his conquests in Flanders. The reasoning would have been just if the King of Spain had died at this time, but he took thirty years to die and the lost occasion never returned.

Causes of the War of Holland.—Louis did not forgive the Dutch for their intervention in his affairs. He had been shocked by the republican pride of their envoy, Van Beuningen, sheriff of Amsterdam, at the conferences of Aix-la-Chapelle. "Do you not trust the king's word?" de Lionne asked him one day. "I do not know what the king wants; I know what he is able to do," was the answer. Louis XIV. also complained of the insolence of the Dutch newspapers and especially of the injurious medals which they had caused to be struck after the peace. It was alleged at the French court that Van Beuningen was represented on a medal with the legend, *In conspectu meo stetit sol*, and that this was an insulting allusion to the emblem which Louis XIV. had chosen, a sun darting its rays on the globe with the following words as a device, *Nec pluribus impar*.

But absolute king though he was, he would not have set Europe in flames for such reasons. The war which the historians have called the war of medals, of personal resentment, was also a tariff war. Louis XIV. doubtless did not love these proud republicans, who owed their existence to his ancestors in his view, but Colbert detested the rivals of French commerce. He had attempted to drive them from the French coasts and to induce the merchants of France to provide for the carriage of their own goods. The Dutch, attacked by tariffs, defended themselves by surtaxing French wine, brandy, and manufactured goods (1660). "It is very bold of the States; you will soon see that they will have reason to repent," wrote Colbert to the ambassador at the Hague.

Louvois, on his side, considered that the true method of conquering the Low Countries from Spain was to humble and weaken the Dutch, and thus on this occasion the minister of finance was not in complete disagreement with the minister of war, and the king was led by his personal annoyance to accept their ideas. The war was, however, impolitic, since it destroyed the whole system of alliances founded by Henry IV. and Richelieu on the Protestant states; since it turned the arms of France from the one adversary whom it was then the interest of France to

strike; and since it led the French forces unwisely far from their own frontier, beyond the lower Rhine, into a land which it would have been useless to conquer and impossible to hold as long as the Spaniards remained at Brussels.

Alliances formed against Holland.—Louis was first concerned to dissolve the Triple Alliance. There was no difficulty in winning over Sweden, the old friend of France; it was a matter of an annual subsidy of 1,500,000 crowns. England would have hesitated had she been consulted, but Louis only addressed himself to Charles II., who was brought up like all his family in ideas of absolute power; he wished to rule without parliament, and to find the money which he needed he consented to become the pensioner of France. In four years he received 8,000,000 livres. The negotiator between the two kings was a princess of twenty-six, Henrietta, sister of Charles II. and wife of Philip of Orleans, usually called Madame. She went to Dover, where magnificent fêtes were held, on pretence of revisiting her brother, and she persuaded him to join with Louis XIV. against the United Provinces (1670). She died suddenly after her return, and Bossuet cried, "Madame is dying, Madame is dead." But this disaster did not modify the resolutions of the two sovereigns.

At the same time de Lionne renewed the treaties with the emperor and the princes of the League of the Rhine, who promised neutrality or help. This was the last triumph of that able diplomat; he died in 1671 and was succeeded by Arnault de Pomponne.

The war finally broke out in 1672. Thirty vessels of fifty to seventy-eight guns joined the English fleet, itself a powerful force of sixty ships of the line and commanded by the Duke of York. Between Sedan and Charleroi 90,000 men were gathered; the Bishop of Münster, the Elector of Cologne, and other German princes furnished some 20,000. The king led this magnificent army in person; Condé, Turenne, Luxemburg, and Chamilly commanded under him; Vauban was there to take towns and Pellisson to describe victories. To oppose so formidable an enemy, Holland had a considerable navy; Tromp and Ruyter, regarded as the first admirals of the age; rich colonies; an immense commerce. But she had neglected her army, a force always suspect in republics, and could count only on 25,000 militia, ill-equipped and undisciplined, while the 20,000 men promised her by her solitary ally, the Elector of Brandenburg, were at once insufficient and far distant. Internal divisions still further weakened her; there were two parties in the republic,

the first of which, led by John de Witt, grand pensionary of Holland, was wholly devoted to the cause of ancient liberty, and the second of which wished to restore to the offices held by his ancestors the young Prince of Orange. Taking advantage of the present danger, they secured his nomination at the age of twenty-two to the post of captain-general.

Invasion of Holland (1672).—Louis advanced along the Meuse, through the territories of his ally, the Bishop of Liége, in order not to violate the neutrality of Spain, and thence to the right bank of the Rhine from Wesel to Toll Huys. "There some countrymen told Condé that the dryness of the season had made the river fordable. The first step was easy; on the other bank there were only four or five hundred horse and two weak regiments of infantry without cannon. The French artillery outflanked them. While the royal household and the best cavalry squadrons passed the river without difficulty to the number of about 15,000 men, Condé coasted down the stream on a boat of leather. Some Dutch cavalry made as if to enter the river and engage, but fled as soon as they saw the strength of their opponents. Their infantry quickly laid down their arms and begged for quarter. No one was lost during the passage except the Count de Nogent and some horsemen who, missing the ford, were drowned. No one would have been killed in this affair had it not been for the rashness of the young Duke de Longueville. It is said that, the wine having mounted to his head, he fired his pistol at the enemy who prayed for their lives on their knees, shouting to them, 'No quarter for these swine.' He shot one of their officers; the Dutch infantry in desperation resumed their arms and fired a volley by which Longueville was slain. A captain of cavalry, who had not fled with the rest, rushed on Condé who was then mounting the bank of the river and put a pistol to his head. The prince moved and turned aside the shot which wounded his hand. Condé received no other hurt. The French in anger fell upon the infantry and put them to flight in every direction. Louis XIV. crossed the river with the infantry on a bridge of boats. (June 12, 1672.) Such was the passage of the Rhine, celebrated at the time as one of those great events which should arrest the attention of posterity. That air of grandeur with which the king invested all his acts, the rapid good fortune of his conquests, the splendour of his reign, the idolatry of the courtiers, and finally the taste of the people, and especially of the Parisians, for exaggeration, combined with that ignorance of war which is characteristic of great cities, all served to cause

the crossing of the Rhine to be regarded at Paris as a prodigious event, which was still further exaggerated. The general idea was that the army had crossed the river at the flood, in the presence of an entrenched army and despite the artillery of an impregnable fort which was called Le Tholus. It is true that nothing could have impressed the enemy more than did this crossing, and that if they had possessed a body of good troops on the further bank the undertaking would have been hazardous to a degree."

When the Rhine had been crossed, Holland lay open to invasion. The provinces of Overyssel, Gelderland, and Utrecht submitted at once, without any attempt at defence; every hour in every day brought the king news of some new conquest. An officer wrote to Turenne, "If you will send me fifty horsemen I can take two or three places with that force." Four soldiers for a moment made themselves masters of Muyden, the key of Amsterdam, since the sluices which allowed the flooding of the suburbs of that capital were there. The generals, called to the council, proposed to advance without delay on the city; Louvois preferred to leave garrisons in the occupied places, and the army was thus weakened and its operations delayed. The Dutch regained their courage and, uniting all the forces of the state in the hands of one man, raised William of Orange to the *stadtholderate*. This prince saved the independence of his country, but he sullied his glory by allowing an infuriated populace to murder the illustrious chiefs of the republican party, John and Cornelius de Witt, two great citizens.

First Coalition against France (1673).—The military dictatorship conferred on the Prince of Orange gave a new aspect to affairs. He caused the dykes to be cut and flooded the country round Amsterdam, forcing the French to fall back before the inundation. William served his country even better in diplomacy. He sent envoys to all the European courts to rouse them against France; he treated with Spain, with the Duke of Lorraine, with the emperor. Many princes of the League of the Rhine abandoned France and the advanced post which Mazarin had placed at the gate of the empire was turned against her. Such was the Grand Alliance of the Hague, the first of those coalitions which France was so often to face.

Campaign of 1673: Capture of Maestricht.—The great Germanic body was always slow to move. While it was preparing, Louis invested Maestricht, the key of the lower Meuse, and Vauban gave it to him. Luxemburg meanwhile held the Dutch; Turenne, who during the previous winter had driven

the Elector of Brandenburg back to the Elbe, checked the imperialists, and d'Estrées exercised the growing French navy by fighting four battles with Ruyter. At this time the English assisted the French, who thus fought two to one; they were soon to be compelled to fight single-handed against the Dutch and English. At the end of the year the imperialists were at last in considerable force; the defection of the Bishop of Würzburg enabled them to reach the Rhine and they formed a junction there with the Prince of Orange, took Bonn, and made their quarters in the electorate of Cologne.

Conquest of Franche-Comté (1674).—The war had become European in character. Louis XIV. changed his plans with a decisive vigour which did him honour. Abandoning Holland, which he could not hold, he turned all his forces against Spain, the weakest of the allies. With Vauban and 25,000 men, he attacked Franche-Comté, and the second conquest of that province was almost as rapid as the first. Besançon was taken in nine days, and the whole district was subdued in six weeks; from that date it has remained a French possession (May, 1674).

Turenne saves Alsace (1674–1675).—The allies planned during this year a double and formidable invasion of France, by way of Lorraine and the Low Countries. Turenne was employed to check the first, Condé to check the second attack. But the enemy showed such a degree of slowness in beginning their operations that the conquest of Franche-Comté had been completed before their forces were set in motion. Turenne was even able to assume the offensive; he passed the Rhine at Philippsburg with 20,000 men, laid waste the Palatinate that the enemy might not draw supplies from it, and fought a number of small battles at Sinzheim and Ladenbourg (July, 1674) where he exhibited tactical skill such as had not been known before his time. But military science cannot always make good numerical deficiencies. Violating the neutrality of Strasburg, 70,000 Germans entered Alsace, and it was believed that the province was lost, Louvois ordering the marshal to retire into Lorraine. Such was not the plan of the great leader, who, in the opinion of Napoleon, increased in daring as he grew older. He wrote to the king asking for freedom of action. "I know," he said, "the strength of the imperial troops, the generals who command them, and the land in which I am; I assume all responsibility and will be answerable for the event." He remained in Alsace as he wished, delivered incessant attacks upon the enemy, and when winter arrived, recrossed the Vosges to take up his quarters in Lorraine.

The enemy, freed at last from this disturbing presence, and believing that the campaign was ended, dispersed, and to simplify the question of supplies encamped from one end of Alsace to the other. Turenne was the father of his soldiers, and as under his command they had no fear of useless fatigue or danger, he secured their absolute devotion. Suddenly, at the beginning of December, during a hard frost, he broke up his camps, marched along the western side of the Vosges, turned round their extremity, and reached Belfort after a twenty days' journey along terrible roads. He fell on the imperialists, who believed that he was fifty leagues away, pressed them back, and crushed them at Mulhouse, Colmar, and Turkheim. Driving them in disorder before him, he at last forced them over the Rhine, having inflicted a loss of 40,000 killed, wounded, and prisoners (January, 1675). This campaign, prepared with such secrecy, executed with such far-sighted daring, and ended in less than six weeks, aroused the enthusiasm of the whole of France. Louis XIV. wrote to the marshal, "I desire you to return to me, for I am most impatient to see you that I may tell you with my own lips what satisfaction the great and important services you have rendered have given me, especially this last victory which you have gained over my enemies." All along the road the people whom Turenne had saved from the ravages of an invasion ran out to greet him with admiration and thanks and his return was a triumphal march to St. Germain.

Battle of Senef (1674).—While Turenne victoriously hurled back the invasion on the east Condé checked that from the north, preventing 90,000 Spaniards and Dutch from entering Champagne. He entrenched himself near Charleroi, before the Sambre, in a position which the Prince of Orange did not dare to attack. Condé, who could never fight a defensive campaign for long, followed the retreat of the allies and attacked their rear-guard at Senef, near Mons (August, 1674), defeated it, dispersed the main body, but advanced in a disorderly manner against the remainder of the allied army which was very strongly posted. When night came on Condé had had three horses killed under him and the battle was still undecided. "Then," says La Fare, an eye-witness, "he ordered new regiments to advance and sought for artillery that he might renew the battle at daybreak. Those who heard the proposal groaned; it was very clear that no one, except the general, had any wish to continue fighting." On the following day, the two armies separated, having both lost from seven to eight thousand men.

The Prince of Orange, in order to prove that he had not been beaten, laid siege to Oudenarde. Condé showed that he had conquered by forcing the prince to abandon this undertaking, but Grave, the last remnant of the French conquests in Holland, opened its gates. Chamilly had defended it for ninety-three days and inflicted a loss of 1600 men upon the assailants.

Last Campaign of Turenne and Condé (1675).—In the spring (June, 1675), Turenne returned to the leadership of the army of the Rhine, and once more engaged in operations in the Palatinate. The emperor sent Montecuculli, who ten years before had defeated the Turks at the Battle of St. Gothard and who was regarded as a consummate tactician, to oppose him. Six weeks were spent by the two commanders in following and in observing each other, and the reputation of each, which had appeared to be incapable of increase, was still further enhanced. Finally the opposing armies met near the village of Saltzbach, on ground which Turenne had selected. The victory of the French appeared to be certain when the marshal, as he was inspecting the position of a battery, was struck by a spent bullet which also took off the arm of St. Hilaire, lieutenant-general of artillery (July 27, 1675). St. Hilaire's son fell in tears on his father. "It is not for me but for that great man that you should weep," cried his father. Turenne's death was a public calamity. Louis XIV., to honour the greatest leader of the age, caused him to be buried at St. Denis in the sepulchre of the kings. But with the passage of time the memory of the services of Turenne grew faint, at least at the court; his renown appeared to be importunate. In 1710, during the disasters of the War of the Spanish Succession, his family built a mausoleum for him in the chapel of St. Eustace; Louis caused the ornaments and arms to be destroyed on the pretext that their appearance was unnecessary.

The death of Turenne caused the loss of all the fruits of his able campaign. The French, discouraged and seemingly filled with terror, fled towards the Rhine; Montecuculli entered Alsace by the bridge of Strasburg. At the same time, Charles IV., Duke of Lorraine, laid siege to the great city of Treves with 20,000 men; Créqui, who attempted to relieve it, was defeated at Consarbrück, threw himself into the town, and after a heroic defence of some weeks was obliged to capitulate by the cowardice of the garrison (September, 1675). "His misfortune will make him a great general," said Condé, and Condé was right.

After the death of Turenne, Condé was sent to Alsace to check the progress of Montecuculli and to restore the confidence of the

troops. He forced the imperialist army to raise the sieges of Saverne and Haguenau and to recross the Rhine. This was his last success; he ceased to appear at the head of armies and retired to Chantilly, where he lived until 1686 in the midst of men of letters, delighting in their discussions, joining in them with spirit, and sometimes, says La Fontaine, taking reason, as he took victory, by the throat.

Campaign of 1676: Naval Victories: Duquesne and d'Estrées.—In the following year the war of sieges was resumed which Louis XIV. preferred. Condé and Bouchain were taken; Maestricht, besieged by the Prince of Orange, was relieved; but the Germans re-entered Philippsburg which du Fay defended for three months and only surrendered when his powder was exhausted. An unexpected glory consoled France for these slight successes and this reverse. The people of Messina, who had revolted from Spain, placed themselves under the protection of Louis XIV. (1675); he sent them a fleet commanded by the Duke de Vivonne, brother of Madame de Montespan, with Duquesne under his orders. That great sailor was born at Dieppe in 1610 and had at first been a merchant sailor and a corsair. He then entered the service of Sweden, where he made his reputation, and returning to France to enter the royal navy, he passed through all the ranks, becoming lieutenant-general; he could not rise to a higher rank as he was a Protestant. On the coasts of Sicily he was opposed to Ruyter and the Spaniards. The first engagement near the island of Stromboli was indecisive (1676); the second, off Syracuse, was a complete victory. Ruyter was killed there; Louis XIV. ordered military honours to be paid in all the French ports to the ship which bore his corpse back to Holland. Finally Duquesne, Vivonne, and Tourville, in a battle near Palermo, annihilated the enemy's fleets, and France for a time possessed the empire of the Mediterranean (1676).

In the same year the Dutch conquered Cayenne and ravaged the French settlements in the Antilles. Vice-Admiral d'Estrées fitted out at his own expense eight vessels which the king entrusted to him, stipulating only for half the prizes taken. With them he regained Cayenne, destroying in the port of Tobago, where they fancied themselves to be free from danger of attack, an enemy squadron of ten vessels. In 1678 d'Estrées also conquered Tobago as well as all the Dutch factories in Senegal. The French flag was supreme in the Atlantic as in the Mediterranean.

Campaign of 1677: Créqui and Luxemburg: Battle of Cassel.—Créqui had succeeded Turenne in Germany, Luxemburg succeeded Condé in the Low Countries. The former repaired the defeat of Consarbrück in a campaign worthy of Turenne. By a series of skilful marches, during which he kept constantly between the enemy and the French frontier, he covered Lorraine and Upper Alsace against an enemy who was in superior numbers; defeated him at Kochersberg, between Strasburg and Saverne (October 7, 1677), and captured Fribourg, with the result that the war was carried to the right bank of the Rhine. Luxemburg (who recalled rather the victor of Rocroi) together with the king took Valenciennes, where the musketeers carried formidable works in broad daylight. He then took Cambrai, and with Monsieur won the Battle of Cassel from the Prince of Orange. St. Omer, a neighbouring town, capitulated (April, 1677), and Ghent opened its gates in the following year.

Defection of England (1678).—Louis XIV. was thus conducting an offensive or defensive with success in every direction; an unexpected event led to the conclusion of peace. The English viewed, not without some alarm, the progress of French influence on the continent and still more the development of French naval power. They murmured at their king, tied in an alliance with so formidable a neighbour, and national opposition became constantly more active in parliament. Charles II. remarked sadly to the French ambassador, de Ruvigny (June 6, 1675), that "pressed by his subjects he was like a besieged town which was incapable of defence." He was obliged to ally with the States-General of Holland, to agree to the marriage of his niece, Mary, with the stadtholder, and to declare war on France (January, 1678).

Treaty of Nimwegen (1678): General Pacification (1679).—Louis XIV. then proposed peace to the United Provinces. The Prince of Orange owed his elevation to the war and tried to break the negotiations by surprising at St. Denys, near Mons, Marshal Luxemburg, who was relying on the armistice. He was repulsed after a desperate fight lasting six hours (August 11, 1678). "I quite expected," he said later, "to be defeated, but this defeat would have little consequence, since when peace was made the troops would be disbanded in any case." What a contempt for human life characterises all warriors! Men are for them of no more account than the pieces on a chessboard.

Holland, England, Spain, and the emperor treated at Nimwegen, the Elector of Brandenburg at St. Germain, and the King

of Denmark at Fontainebleau (August, 1678, to September, 1679). Once more Spain paid the cost of the war; she abandoned Franche-Comté and surrendered in the Low Countries the last two towns of Artois, Aire and St. Omer, with twelve other places, including Cambrai, Valenciennes, Maubeuge, Condé, and Bouchain, which Vauban soon supplied with fortifications to enable them to serve as a barrier for France. The Elector of Brandenburg and the King of Denmark had to restore all that they had taken from the Swedes. But France, deviating from the commercial policy of Colbert, granted the abolition of the tariff of 1667 to the Dutch, and thus struck a severe blow to the mercantile marine and even to the industry of France. The Treaty of Nimwegen was the crowning glory of the reign of Louis XIV., to whom soon after the magistrates of Paris granted the title of Great (1680). They had already raised two triumphal arches for this war, those of St. Martin and St. Denis.

CHAPTER LII

LAST PERIOD OF THE REIGN OF LOUIS XIV. (1679–1715)

Conquests of Louis XIV. during the Period of Peace.—After the Treaty of Nimwegen the other nations disbanded their armies, while Louis maintained his forces on a war footing and converted a period of peace into a time of conquests. The agreements, so recently concluded, had assigned to him a certain number of places, towns, and cantons, with their dependencies, and in order to discover what these dependencies were, Louis established at Tournai, Metz, Breisach, and Besançon the so-called *Chambers of Reunion*, which derived their title from the fact that they were employed to reunite to France the lands of which the towns of Flanders, the Three Bishoprics, Alsace, and Franche-Comté were alleged to have been dispossessed. The princes of Germany, the elector palatine, and the King of Spain were to appear by their proctors to defend their titles, and the decrees of these chambers, enforced by superior strength, handed over to Louis twenty important towns, including Sarrebrück, Deux-Ponts, Luxemburg, Montbéliard, and Strasburg, which Vauban converted into the main defence of the kingdom on the side of the Rhine (1681). In Italy Louis bought Casale in Montferrat from the Duke of Modena, in order to control the north

of the peninsula and Piedmont, already held in check by means of Pignerol (1681).

The French flag was displayed in other quarters and in a more legitimate cause. The Barbary pirates had resumed their depredations, and the veteran Duquesne was sent against them. An obscure sailor, Bernard Renau, invented a terrible engine of destruction for maritime places, galleys mounting mortars. Algiers was twice bombarded (1681–1684), partially destroyed, and forced to deliver its prisoners. Tunis and Tripoli suffered the same fate, and the Mediterranean was freed from pirates for some time.

A Christian city was treated in the same way as these piratical haunts. The Genoese had sold arms and powder to the Algerians, and they had built in their dockyards four warships for Spain, who had no fleet. Louis XIV. forbade them to arm the galleys, and when they refused to submit, Duquesne and Seignelay hurled 14,000 bombs into the city in a few days, destroying part of the magnificent palace of Genoa the Superb (1684). The doge was obliged to go to Versailles to beg pardon of the king, despite the ancient law which forbade the first magistrate of the republic ever to leave the city. He was asked what he found most remarkable in Versailles. "That I should be seen there," was his reply.

Even the pope was at one and the same time humiliated as a prince and wounded as a pontiff. The Catholic ambassadors at Rome had extended their rights of asylum and franchise, enjoyed from time immemorial in their embassies, over the whole quarter of the city in which they lived. Innocent XI. was anxious to put an end to this abuse, which made half Rome the habitual resort of criminals. He secured the assent of the other kings without difficulty, but Louis XIV., already irritated against the pope in the matter of the regalian rights, answered loftily that he had never been guided by the example of others and that it was for them to follow his lead. He sent the Marquis de Lavardin with 800 armed gentlemen to maintain his possession of this unjust privilege; the pope excommunicated the ambassador and the king seized Avignon (1687).

The matter was settled under the successor of Innocent XI., but the pontiff was deeply offended, a fact which was not without its influence on the war of 1688. The occasion of that war was the opposition offered by the pope to the French candidate for the Archbishopric of Cologne, Cardinal Furstemberg, who had already opened the gates of Strasburg to France. He was elected by a majority of the chapter, fifteen votes being recorded

for him against nine cast for his opponent, Clement of Bavaria. But Innocent XI. refused investiture to Furstemberg, on the plea that being already Bishop of Strasburg he might not be translated without papal sanction, and gave Cologne to Clement. Louis protested in arms against this decision; his troops occupied Bonn, Neuss, and Kaiserwerth (October, 1688). At the same time, he laid claim to part of the Palatinate in the name of his sister-in-law, the second wife of the Duke of Orleans.

League of Augsburg (1686).—These conquests, made in time of peace, these acts of violence, and this display of pride revived the fears of Europe. France was accused of having destroyed the domination of Austria in order to establish her own, to weigh down Europe as the Hapsburgs had done. As early as 1681, the empire, the Emperor Leopold, Spain, Holland, and even Sweden concluded, through the efforts of William of Orange, a secret alliance to maintain the peace of Nimwegen. No one dared to strike the first blow, and the diet of Ratisbon (August, 1684) declared for twenty years' truce which left Luxemburg, Landau, Strasburg, Kehl, and the other towns "reunited" prior to August 8, 1681, to France. As this did not satisfy Louis's ambition, the states came together once more and signed the League of Augsburg (July, 1686), to which Sweden adhered in the following year and England in 1689.

Internal Condition of France: Death of Colbert (1683).—At this critical moment, a weariness seemed to beset French society, brilliant as it still was and prosperous as it appeared to be. The heavy expenses of the last war, the maintenance in time of peace of an army of 150,000 men, the vainglorious buildings, such as those of Versailles, Trianon, Marly, the Louvre, and the Tuileries, or the buildings of public utility, the construction of ports, fortresses, and the Hôtel des Invalides, had combined to destroy the balance of the finances, to compel an increase of taxation, and to deal a first blow at agriculture and commerce. As early as 1680, Colbert had told the king that every letter from the provinces spoke of the deep misery of the people. But Louis XIV. easily elevated his practice into a theory and was ever fond of arrogating to his habits the character of a principle of government. In order to justify unlimited taxation, he soon secured from the Sorbonne an official declaration that he was absolute master of the life and goods of his subjects, and in order to quiet his conscience in the matter of his monstrous prodigality, he replied to Madame de Maintenon, who demanded money from him for the poor, "A king dispenses charity by

spending largely." A precious and terrible saying, remarks Say, which indicated how ruin might be reduced to a principle.

Colbert was thus very ill-advised to preach economy to Louis. Some popular movements, indications of the unrest of the people, which took place in various provinces did not afford a warning. They were cruelly repressed, and the deficit was continually increased. Colbert, to fill the gap between revenue and expenditure, was reduced to find new resources; even he was obliged to sell offices, to raise loans at a ruinous rate of interest, and to increase the *taille*. He was distressed to see the finances falling back into the state from which he had rescued them and to see also, after the concessions made to the Dutch by the Treaty of Nimwegen, foreign competition once more injuring the sea-borne commerce and industry of France. He succumbed to his new difficulties, dying in 1683 at the age of sixty-four, worn out by overwork, killed, perhaps, by the unjust reproaches of the king. "Had I done for God what I have done for that man I should have won salvation ten times over; now I know not what fate is in store for me," he said. He refused to read the king's last letter to him. Like many great French ministers, Colbert was unpopular. The people cursed the man who drew up the financial edicts instead of the man who had dictated them, and finding that twenty-two years of office had enabled Colbert to amass a fortune of 10 million livres they suspected his probity instead of realising his economy. It was found necessary to bury at night, without pomp and under guard, one of the benefactors of France, that a furious mob might not insult his funeral procession. After his death his ministry was divided; his son, the Marquis de Seignelay, took the marine, while the finances were entrusted first to Le Pelletier (1683-1689) and later to the Count de Pontchartrain (1689-1699), who succeeded Colbert without replacing him. As early as 1689, financial embarrassment was so great that Louis was forced to send to the treasury the masterpieces of chased silver which decorated Versailles.

Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685).—Two years after the death of Colbert, Louis committed the great error of his reign, the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. The Protestants had remained quiet during the troubles of the *Fronde*, and in 1652 Louis XIV. had solemnly renewed the undertaking not to disturb their liberty of conscience. But he hated them as heretics and because they were thought to have little affection for absolute monarchy. Religious unity seemed to him to be as necessary as political. "I formed my scheme of conduct towards

my subjects of the reformed faith as early as 1661," he says in his *Mémoires*, "and I felt that the best means would be to reduce them gradually, not imposing any new hardship upon them, and observing the liberties granted by my predecessors, but granting them nothing beyond those liberties and confining the exercise of their privileges within the narrowest limits that justice and kindness permit. As to their privileges which depended upon me, I resolved to grant them none in order to force them to consider of their own accord and without violence if they had any good reason for voluntarily depriving themselves of the advantages which they might enjoy in common with my other subjects." He was long true to this ungenerous policy. Colbert went further, protecting the Protestants as useful and industrious subjects. He employed many in the arts, manufactures, and navy. Duquesne, the worthy rival of Ruyter, and Van Robais, the great manufacturer of Abbeville, were of the reformed faith, and Colbert even suggested to Louis XIV. the appointment of the Protestant Perrot d'Ablancourt to the position of court historian.

After the Treaty of Nimwegen, various influences, which combined to affect Louis, already growing old, served to lead the government to a more rigorous policy. The king was then engaged in a lively dispute with the papacy on the subject of regalian rights and was anxious to secure the support of the French clergy for the celebrated declaration of 1682, drawn up by Bossuet. He was eager that there should be no doubt of his zeal for the Church, and the Protestants afforded an opportunity for him to show that such zeal was not lacking. The securities which the Edict of Nantes had assured to the reformed religion were abolished by the suppression of the mixed chambers in the parliaments of Toulouse, Grenoble, and Bordeaux, and of those liberties which Richelieu and Mazarin had left untouched. Protestants were in succession forbidden to practise as lawyers, printers, booksellers, doctors, surgeons, and even as chemists, a prohibition which forced them, expelled from public functions and the liberal professions, to throw themselves into commerce which fell almost entirely into their hands. The Catholics were forbidden, under pain of the galleys for life, to embrace Calvinism, while the children of Protestants were permitted to change their religion at the age of seven years, at which age, according to the edict, they were capable of reasoning and deciding upon so important a matter as their salvation. As a result of this declaration, many children were torn from their families, and for young

girls of noble birth so converted, Madame de Maintenon founded the convent of St. Cyr. Missions in the provinces were increased, consciences were bought for money, and Pellisson, an ex-Protestant, as the latest favourite, had the direction of a special fund to pay for these abjurations. "Pellisson is extravagant," says Madame de Maintenon (November 13, 1683), "while Bossuet is wiser and more persuasive; it could not have been hoped that all these converts would have been made so easily." Louvois had recourse to still more persuasive means; he thought of mingling the Protestants with the soldiery, and soldiers were therefore quartered on Calvinists. These booted missionaries committed great excesses, and as the dragoons were distinguished for their violence, these measures became known as the *dragonnades*.

Finally the last blow was struck, and an edict appeared revoking the Edict of Nantes (October 22, 1685). All privileges granted to the Protestants by Henry IV. and Louis XIII. were suppressed; public worship was forbidden to them, except in Alsace; their ministers were to leave the realm in fifteen days, and lay Protestants were forbidden to follow them, under pain of the galleys and forfeiture. The resulting condition was monstrous; the reformed no longer possessed a civil status; their marriages were null, their children bastards, unless, by some fraud or lie, the wedding had been blessed by the Catholic Church. The goods of all proved heretics were confiscated, a share being assured to the informer. Nor did they suffer only in their goods and consciences; a large number of ministers were executed, and that their last exhortations might not be heard, drums at the foot of the scaffold drowned their words—a curious anticipation of the death scene of Louis XVI. It must be admitted that this disastrous and criminal measure was hailed with applause by the majority of the nation. Vauban, St. Simon, and Catinat, and a few superior minds alone realised the evil which it would inflict on the country. It was approved not only by Bossuet and Massillon, but by Racine, La Bruyère; even La Fontaine, Mademoiselle de Scudéri, the sweet Madame Deshouilière. Madame de Sévigné, always lively, without being always tender, at least to those who were not connected with her, wrote (October 28, 1685), "The dragoons are excellent missionaries," and in another letter, "Nothing so good, nothing so fine or memorable has ever been done by any king." The old chancellor, Le Tellier, who was dying, rallied himself that he might sign the edict, crying, *Nunc dimitte servum tuum, Domine,*

quia viderunt oculi mei salutare tuum. He failed to see that he had signed one of the great disasters of France. Between 250,000 and 300,000 Protestants crossed the frontier despite the police of Louis XIV. and carried to foreign lands the arts and manufacturing secrets of France, for which country they felt undying hatred. Whole regiments of Calvinists were created in England, Holland, and Germany, while those who remained in the kingdom thought only of an opportunity of breaking, even at the cost of civil war, the unjust yoke which weighed them down. Marshal Schomberg was expatriated; Huygens, Papin, painters, and sculptors were expelled from the Academy and from France. Duquesne, burdened with glory and his eighty-four years, was urged by the king in person to abjure. "I have rendered unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's for sixty years," he answered. "Permit me, therefore, to render unto God the things that are God's." He was at least allowed to die in France.

The success of this violence was dubious. There were a million Calvinists in France at the time of the revocation of the edict; there are now more than that number. Nor is it possible to estimate how great an impetus this great persecution, which once begun could not be checked, gave to the sceptical and cynical philosophy of the eighteenth century. The immediate result of the measure was to provoke an outburst against France which produced a terrible war and inaugurated a period of reverses.

Revolution in England (1688).—The answer of the Protestant powers to the revocation of the Edict of Nantes was the English revolution, which hurled the Catholic James II. from his throne and placed upon it the Calvinist William III. (1688). This successful movement established across the Channel limited monarchy in the place of monarchy by divine right. It began constitutional or parliamentary government, involving the discussion of the great affairs of state, the voting of laws, and the imposition of taxes by the representatives of the people. This right of peoples was a new feature in modern society, opposed to that absolute rule of kings which had reigned for two centuries and which reached its most glorious embodiment in the France of Louis XIV. It is not surprising that a bloody conflict broke out between France and England, a struggle which was not merely a conflict of two opposing interests, but of two opposing principles. In the sixteenth century France had undertaken the defence of Protestantism and of the common liberties of Europe; in the seventeenth she threatened the conscience of peoples and

the independence of states. The rôle which France abandoned was seized by England, which became the centre of all coalitions against the Bourbons, as France had been the centre of all resistance to the Hapsburgs.

This change of policy involved a modification of all the conditions of war. As long as Louis had neutralised England by pensioning her kings France had nothing to fear on the continent, since, supported by the Pyrenees, the Alps, and the sea, she could face the Rhine and fight with her full strength without being obliged to guard her rear. England united the enemies of France, and it was necessary not only to have armies on the Scheldt, the Rhine, and the Alps, but also fleets in the Atlantic and in the most distant seas. This dual effort France could not bear indefinitely.

War of the League of Augsburg (1688–1697).—The coalition declared war on February 5, 1689. Louis had 350,000 soldiers and a fleet of 264 vessels to oppose the allies. Standing alone against princes in ill-accord with one another and ill-obeyed by their subjects, he formed a plan which was at once simple and bold. The soul of the coalition was William of Orange, stadtholder of Holland and King of England; if he were overthrown, the war would be ended at a single blow. Louis therefore supplied a fleet to James II. to assist him to regain his throne. Spain and Savoy were the two weakest states of the league; Louis turned against them the larger part of his forces. On this side he attacked; on the Rhine, the left bank of which he held as far as Coblentz, he preserved the defensive, feeling sure that the Turks, whose negotiations with the emperor had been broken off as a result of French efforts, would keep that prince sufficiently occupied on the Danube, so that France need have no reason to fear the arrival of large imperialist forces on the Rhine. Turenne, Condé, and Duquesne were dead; Louis found able leaders to replace them in Luxemburg, Catinat, Boufflers, de Lorges, and Tourville. It was the calling out of the first reserve of France in these terrible wars which slew so many of her generals and so many of her armies.

Attempts to restore James II.: Tourville.—The war in support of James II. was at first successful. A squadron of thirteen large vessels carried the prince to Ireland, an island which was devotedly Catholic and which was always restless under the English yoke (1689). Convoys of troops, arms, and munitions left Le Havre, Brest, and Rochefort, protected by Château-Renaud, d'Estrées, and Tourville. The English and Dutch

attempted to intercept their passage, but Château-Renaud beat one of their squadrons in Bantry Bay ; Tourville, with seventy-eight ships, attacking their main fleet on the Sussex coast off Beachy Head, sank or burned sixteen of their vessels, while the rest took refuge in the mouth of the Thames or among the Dutch banks (July 10, 1690). This brilliant victory gave Louis XIV. the mastery of the sea for some time, but James II. was unable to second his ally. He lost precious time at the siege of Londonderry. William III. attacked him on the Boyne ; the Irish fled at the first shock, their king with them, and only the French offered any resistance. A regiment of Calvinist refugees and Marshal Schomberg, who commanded William's army, contributed mainly to this defeat. James returned to France (July 11, 1690).

Louis XIV. then prepared a descent upon England itself; 20,000 men were gathered at Cherbourg and La Hogue ; 300 transports were held ready at Brest ; Tourville was to escort them with forty-four vessels which were under his command reinforced by thirty which d'Estrées was to supply from Toulon. But the wind changed and the Mediterranean fleet could not arrive in time. Louis, accustomed to force victory, and also counting on the defection of some of the enemy captains, ordered his admiral to seek the English and Dutch fleets, ninety-nine vessels in all. The Battle of La Hogue followed (May 29, 1692). There was no defection. Tourville made head against the enemy successfully for ten hours and the Anglo-Dutch, despite their numbers, suffered more than the French. But on the following day it was impossible to renew the battle. Tourville would have made a glorious retreat if he had possessed an open port in his rear. But the mole of Cherbourg did not then exist. He ordered a retirement on Brest and St. Malo ; seven of his ships gained the first port, the remainder entered the channel which appears at high tide on the west coast of the Cotentin. Twenty-two passed through the Race of Alderney and entered St. Malo ; then the tide went out and the rest were unable to follow. Three stopped at Cherbourg, where their captains, unable to defend them, burned them. Twelve took refuge in the harbour of La Hogue which was no better prepared to resist an attack. Tourville took out their cannons and munitions and removed their rigging ; when the English approached he set the hulls of the ships on fire. The enemy could not boast a single capture. This was the first blow struck at the French navy, but it is not true, as has been often said, that the disaster of La Hogue was that navy's tomb, for in the following year, equal,

if not superior, fleets were opposed to the English and Dutch. The restoration of the Stuarts in England became impossible, and the most important part of Louis's plan had failed.

Defensive War on the Rhine: Duras: De Lorges.—Already in 1688 the dauphin, then aged twenty-seven, had invaded Germany with 80,000 men and Marshal Duras as his instructor. The king had said to him, prior to his departure, "My son, in sending you to command my armies I supply you with an occasion to show your merit; make it known to all Europe that when I am dead the king will not be dead." Philippsburg, Mannheim, Worms, and Oberwesel were taken in a few weeks. It was not the intention of the French to preserve these conquests; the Palatinate was again ravaged, and on this occasion with ferocity; 100,000 persons, driven from their land by the flames, went to seek vengeance in Germany (1689). The king himself regretted these horrible occurrences, and his discontent would probably have led to the disgrace of Louvois had not that minister died of apoplexy (July, 1691). He was replaced by his son, Barbezieux, who had all his father's faults and none of his ability.

The Duke de Lorges, nephew of the great Turenne, who succeeded Marshal Duras (1690), was content to cover Alsace against the imperialists, who found the Palatinate a desert in which they could not exist. The war on the Rhine remained defensive as had been intended; the great blows were struck elsewhere.

War in Savoy and Piedmont: Catinat.—Catinat commanded in Italy; he was a general of humble birth who had risen by merit. Like Vauban, whose friend he was, he united civil virtues with military qualities, and by his wise and methodical tactics recalled Turenne, though he was very inferior to that great general. He was opposed by Victor Amadeus, Duke of Savoy. To force his opponent to a decisive battle before the arrival of German troops he laid waste the plains of Piedmont, cut down the trees, uprooted the vines, and burned the villages. Victor Amadeus was unable to bear these ravages with patience and joined battle at Staffarda, near Saluzzo (August 18, 1690). He lost 4000 men, while the French lost barely 500. Savoy, Nice, and the greater part of Piedmont fell into the power of France. But a relative of the duke, Prince Eugene, whose services Louis XIV. had refused and who had then offered them to Austria, arrived with powerful reinforcements. Catinat was obliged to return to France, followed by the Piedmontese, and Dauphiné suffered

cruel reprisals for the burning of the Palatinate (1692). But Catinat recrossed the Alps and fought a second battle near Marsaglia, not far from Staffarda (October 4, 1693), where Victor Amadeus suffered a second defeat as disastrous as the first. Little was left to him except Turin, and Catinat would have taken that city had not his army been reduced so that he could merely retain his conquests.

War in the Low Countries: Luxemburg.—Luxemburg was the posthumous son of that Count de Bouteville who had been executed by Richelieu. He had first served under Condé, whom he resembled in his daring and his quickness of judgment. In 1690 he found himself near Fleurus in face of the Prince of Waldeck. By a bold and skilful manœuvre he moved his right wing behind some rising ground which covered the enemy's army. The prince, suddenly attacked on the flank and finding his position turned, retreated; Luxemburg seized the opportunity to attack while his opponent was in disorder, killed 6000 men, captured 100 standards, the enemy's cannon and baggage, and took 8000 prisoners (July 31, 1690). Master of the open country, he then invested Mons, the capital of Hainault, at which siege Louis XIV. was present. William III., freed from James II., hastened to its relief with 80,000 men, but he was unable to prevent the capitulation of the town after nine days' siege (April, 1691). In the next year Luxemburg besieged Namur, the strongest place in the Low Countries at the junction of the Sambre and Meuse, and took it under the eyes of Louis XIV. and the enemy army (June, 1692). This was one of the great sieges of the century; Vauban conducted it and the operation was regarded as a model. The place was defended by Cohorn, Vauban's rival, who had constructed part of the fortifications.

But William, though always defeated, never grew weary. On August 3, 1692, he surprised Luxemburg at Steinkirk in Hainault. "A spy, who had been employed by the marshal with William, was discovered, and was obliged before being put to death to write false information to Luxemburg. Following this information, the marshal took the very measures which seemed bound to ensure his defeat. His sleeping army was attacked at dawn; a brigade was at once put to flight, and the general saved himself with difficulty. Without prodigies of energy and bravery all would have been lost. Luxemburg was ill; the danger revived his strength; great achievements were needed to avoid defeat and he achieved them. To change the ground,

to give his army a battlefield which they had not, to restore the right which was in complete disorder, to rally his troops three times, was the work of some two hours. He had in his army Philip of Orleans, Duke of Chartres, afterwards the regent, who was then only fifteen. He would have been unable to strike any decisive blow, but it was much for the encouragement of the army that a grandson of France, still a boy, should charge with the royal household, should be wounded in the conflict, and return to the charge despite his wound. A grandson and a great-nephew of Condé, Louis de Bourbon and the Prince of Conti, and a grandson of Henry IV., the Duke of Vendôme, were also present. Called by the popular voice to the command of armies, they desired that glory passionately, but they never attained it, because Louis knew their ambition no less than their merit, and always remembered the Condé who had made war upon him. All these princes placed themselves at the head of the royal household to charge a body of English who held an important position on which the success of the battle depended. The slaughter was great and the French at last carried the post. The regiment of Champagne defeated William's guards, and when the English had been conquered the rest gave way. Boufflers, afterwards Marshal of France, arrived on the scene from some distance at this moment with some dragoons and completed the victory. William, having lost about 7000 men, retired in as good order as he had attacked. The victory, due to the valour of these young princes and of the chief nobility of the kingdom, created a greater effect than any other battle had made upon the court, at Paris, and in the provinces. M. le duc, the Prince of Conti, M. de Vendôme, and their friends found the roads lined with people on their return; cheers and delight bordered on madness. Men then wore cravats of lace, which were arranged with difficulty and much expenditure of time. The princes, having dressed hastily for the battle, had passed their cravats negligently round their throats; women wore ornaments made on this model, which were called steinkirks."

The following year Louis had a good chance of conquering the Low Countries and securing peace. William of Orange had approached Louvain with only 50,000 men; Louis was near with over 100,000 and all the army thought that some great blow would be struck. But it was represented to the king that he ought not to expose his person to the dangers of a battle, and despite Luxemburg, who threw himself on his knees, the king declared that the campaign was ended and returned to Ver-

sailles. From that time he did not appear with the army. His reputation suffered much abroad; mordant satires paraphrased the famous verse of Boileau:

> "Louis les animant du feu de son courage,
> Se plaint de sa grandeur qui l'attache au rivage."

Yet he appears not to have lacked personal courage. His conduct in camp was satisfactory; he had no dash, but no timidity; he exposed himself sufficiently. At the siege of Namur, according to Dangeau, men behind him were wounded.

The victories of Fleurus and Steinkirk had given Hainault and the province of Namur to Luxemburg; he penetrated into southern Brabant. But he still found William III. before him strongly entrenched at the village of Nerwinden between Liége and Louvain (July 29, 1693). Few battles have been more bloody; Nerwinden was twice carried by the infantry, who for the first time charged resolutely with the bayonet, an example followed two months later by the troops of Catinat at Marsaglia. For four hours the French cavalry remained under the dropping fire of eighty cannon, and William, seeing them reform their ranks as soon as gaps were made in them, cried in admiration and disgust, "O insolent nation!" There were 20,000 dead, 12,000 being on the side of the allies. It might have been possible after this success to march on Brussels and dictate peace; the army was retained at the siege and capture of Charleroi. This gave France the important line of the Sambre, from which an army could dominate the Low Countries and render any hostile attempt on Flanders or Artois very dangerous.

The victory of Nerwinden was the last triumph of Luxemburg, "the tapissier de Notre-Dame," as Conti called him, on account of the numerous flags with which he had caused that cathedral to be decorated. The following campaign was not marked by any incident, and the marshal died in January, 1695. His successor, the Duke of Villeroy, was not able to do anything considerable with an army of over 80,000; he did not even prevent William from retaking Namur (September, 1695). But in Spain Vendôme entered Barcelona after a memorable siege and a victory gained over the relieving Spanish army (August, 1695).

At sea Tourville had avenged the disaster of La Hogue by a victory in the Bay of Lagos, near Cape St. Vincent (1693). The following year saw the suspension of great armaments, as Seignelay was dead, but corsairs whose names have remained

famous, Jean Bart, Duguay-Trouin, Pontis, and Nesmond, devastated English and Dutch commerce; these countries in revenge tried to blockade the French coast and hurled infernal machines on St. Malo, Le Havre, Dieppe, Calais, and Dunkirk. Vain and ruinous threats. Dieppe alone suffered. In America Count de Frontenac bravely defended Canada by taking the offensive in every direction, though the province had only some 11,000 inhabitants, while the English colonies had ten times that number. Hudson Bay and almost all Newfoundland were conquered.

Treaty of Ryswick (1697).—But the war languished and all were weary. Louis proposed peace. Charles II. of Spain was dying, this time certainly so; he had no child and the problem of the Spanish succession was therefore opened. The king needed the dissolution of the European coalition before Charles died. He showed an unwonted moderation; he first detached the Duke of Savoy from the League by restoring to him all his towns, including even Pignerol, and proposing the marriage of his daughter with the young Duke of Burgundy, son of the dauphin (1696). The defection of Victor Amadeus decided the other princes, and peace was signed at Ryswick, near the Hague (October, 1697). Louis XIV. recognised William III. as legitimate King of England and Ireland. He restored his recent conquests in the Low Countries, the empire, and Spain, with the exception of Strasburg, Landau, Longwy, and Saarlouis, which had been built in 1680 to defend the valley of the Saar. He allowed the Dutch to garrison the most important places in Flanders, which the Spaniards appeared to be unable to defend against him. He restored Lorraine, which France had held in military occupation for sixty years. The tariff of 1667, so burdensome to the Dutch, had been abolished by the Treaty of Nimwegen; the duty of fifty sous per ton was abolished in 1697, and as a result, after being ruined by taxes during the war, the country was ruined by treaties when peace was restored, the commercial policy of Colbert being completely abandoned. These concessions, of which some cost much to the king's pride, were greatly blamed, but Louis hoped to repair them and the loss of some towns by the acquisition of an empire. In America the treaty left France all Hudson Bay and half Newfoundland.

Accession of a French Prince to the Throne of Spain (1700).—Charles II. lingered for three years, during which the question of his inheritance was debated. The two houses of France and Austria, allied for a century to that of Spain by marriage, alike

claimed the throne. The possibility of the accession of either alarmed the maritime powers, England and Holland, who saw the equilibrium of Europe destroyed whether Louis XIV. or Leopold reigned at Madrid. William III. was thus led to suggest to the cabinet of Versailles the partition of an inheritance which was not yet vacant. Two treaties were signed at the Hague. By the first (1698) the Spanish crown was given to a Bavarian prince; the province of Milan to the Archduke Charles, second son of the emperor; the Two Sicilies, some Tuscan ports, and Guipuzcoa to the dauphin. This arrangement contained illusory or dangerous advantages for France. The royal family would certainly have gained a crown, but France would assuredly have been led by this acquisition to engage in adventures beyond the Alps. A second treaty, concluded after the death of the Electoral Prince of Bavaria, gave Spain to the archduke, and only increased the share of France by Lorraine, a province which at the first cannon-shot was already in the power of France (1700). This offered no compensation for the fact that an Austrian was to rule at Brussels and at Madrid.

These treaties, unsatisfactory to France, were happily rendered void. The dying king had been deeply offended at the idea of the dismemberment of his monarchy, proposed during his life and without consulting him. In order to maintain the integrity of his dominions, it was necessary to give them all either to France or to Austria. The latter was badly served by her ambassador at Madrid; France was well served by the Marquis d'Harcourt, her minister at the court of Charles, and by his last will that king called to the throne Philip of Anjou, second son of the dauphin. In event of his refusal the crown was to pass to his brother, the Duke of Berry, and in the last instance to the Archduke Charles (November 2, 1700). Twenty-eight days later, Charles II. of Spain died. He had hoped to save the integrity of his monarchy by making it the interest of Louis XIV. to preserve it.

At once the question arose as to whether Louis would accept the will or abide by the last treaty of the Hague. An extraordinary council was held, at which only four persons were present, the dauphin, the Duke of Beauvilliers, governor of the children of France, Marquis de Torcy, nephew of the great Colbert and then minister of foreign affairs, and the chancellor Pontchartrain. Opinion was divided, but Torcy remarked with reason that the refusal of France would cause the succession to pass to Austria; that the advantages of the last treaty were

illusory or unimportant; that the emperor had in no case accepted it; that there would be war whatever decision were taken, and that it was thus better to fight for the whole than for a part. Louis XIV. remained silent; for three days his decision was unknown. Finally he declared it to the Duke of Anjou in these words, "Monsieur, the King of Spain has made you a king. The nobles demand you, the people desire you, and I give my consent. Take care only that you remain a Prince of France." He presented him to his court, saying, "Gentlemen, the King of Spain" (November 6, 1700). Some weeks later Philip left for Madrid. "Thus," says St. Simon, "the eighteenth century opened for the house of France with a blaze of glory and of unexpected prosperity."

Third Coalition against France (1701–1713): Grand Alliance of the Hague.—France had then two great interests. The first was that Spain should be friendly, that peace might be assured on the southern frontier and that she might be able at need to throw all her forces to the north-east where she was most vulnerable. The second was that the north-eastern frontier should be pushed back from Paris and that the Low Countries should at least be allied to her. The first point seemed to be gained by the accession to the Spanish throne of a Bourbon, whom the Spaniards received with enthusiasm and whom the other states recognised. The emperor protested and armed, but alone he could do nothing. The second aim was more difficult to attain, since neither England nor Holland wished to see France in possession of the mouths of the Scheldt. To secure it much tact and prudence were needed. But unfortunately the king disclosed his designs too soon and braved Europe at his pleasure. Despite the formal clauses of the will of Charles II., Louis did not require Philip to renounce the throne of France and by letters patent of December, 1700, he preserved to him his hereditary rank between the Dukes of Burgundy and Berry. He thus rendered possible the reunion of the two monarchies, and displayed to an alarmed world the prospect of France and Spain being one day ruled by the same king, a contingency which would have been profitable neither for one country nor the other, and still less profitable for Europe. A little later he expelled the Dutch from the places which they occupied in the Low Countries in virtue of the Treaty of Ryswick, and replaced them with French garrisons. Finally, on the death of James II., Louis continued to the Prince of Wales, his son, the title of King of England, Scotland, and Ireland, despite the advice of all his

ministers. This insult to the English people and to William III. made war inevitable.

A third coalition was formed, the *Grand Alliance of the Hague* (September, 1700); it was composed of England, Holland, Austria, the empire, and a little later Portugal, which had become hostile to France owing to the accession of a French prince to the throne of Spain, and because French ports were closed to its goods. There remained no allies in Europe for Louis except the Elector of Bavaria, to whom the Low Countries were secretly promised, and the Dukes of Modena and Savoy, who soon changed sides. Spain was with France, but having neither an army nor a fleet nor money, "she was a body without a soul, which France had to feed and support at her own expense," said Torcy.

William III. hardly saw the beginning of this war. He died in March, 1702, but his policy survived him, because it was the policy of the nation. Under his sister-in-law, Anne Stuart, a Protestant, though a daughter of James II., England continued to defend her political and religious liberties, threatened by the king that Louis wished to impose upon her, and her commercial prosperity which was menaced by the dominion of the house of Bourbon over so many states and so many seas.

Marlborough and Prince Eugène.—Three men, rendered famous by their hatred of France, Heinsius, Marlborough, and Prince Eugène, replaced by their close union the chief whom the alliance had lost. Heinsius was grand pensionary of Holland; he directed the republic with the authority of a king when the stadtholdership was abolished on the death of William III. Churchill, Duke of Marlborough, had first practised the art of war under Turenne. He ruled Queen Anne through his wife, parliament through his friends, the ministry through his son-in-law Sunderland, secretary of state for war, and by the grand treasurer Godolphin, father-in-law of one of his daughters. Prince Eugène, born in France about 1663, son of a Count of Soissons and a niece of Mazarin (that Olympia Mancini whom Louis XIV. had for a time distinguished), belonged to the house of Savoy. Destined for a clerical career, he preferred the profession of arms, and at the age of nineteen asked a regiment of Louis XIV., who refused to make a colonel of a Savoyard abbé. Austria received him better and sent him to fight in Italy against Catinat. After the Peace of Ryswick he made progress against the Turks, who had invaded Hungary, and gained over them at Zenta a signal victory, which placed him in the opinion of his

contemporaries on a level with the illustrious Sobieski, the saviour of Vienna (1697). Named president of the council of war, he prepared as minister the expeditions which he conducted as general, and he had a decisive influence on subsequent events. Owing to his good understanding with Marlborough he gave the European coalition that union which it had always lacked in the past.

Situation of France.—To triumph over so formidable an array of enemies France needed the great men of the past generation. But Louis had used them and in the stifling atmosphere of Versailles their successors could not be bred. Like a land which has produced too much, France began to grow exhausted and soldiers were soon lacking, no less than generals and ministers. The incapable Chamillart, a creature of Madame de Maintenon, collapsed under the dual burden of the finances and the war, which Colbert and Louvois had shared. The king undertook to direct affairs himself, and never did he show more activity, drawing up plans of campaign and directing their execution from the recesses of his cabinet. But there was a further difficulty. Living this retired life he ceased to understand either men or affairs. "The generals," says Voltaire, "were handicapped by definite orders, as the ambassadors were limited by their instructions. If a general wished to undertake anything of moment he was obliged to ask leave by a courier, who found when he returned that the occasion had been lost or the general defeated." Yet some of the French leaders, Villars, Catinat, Boufflers, Vendôme, deserved more confidence and more freedom of action. It is true that such generals as Villeroy, Taillard, Marsin, and La Feuillade needed counsel and guidance, but holding these generals in the leash did not prevent the French armies from suffering irreparable disasters.

First Campaign in Germany, Italy, and the Low Countries (1701–1704).—In the opinion of Louis XIV. the war was to be defensive on all sides except in Germany, to which the Elector of Bavaria called the French. Boufflers was sent to the Low Countries to hold Marlborough and the Anglo-Dutch army in check; Catinat in Italy was to close the Milanese to Eugène and the imperialists; Villars in Germany was to join the elector and march on Vienna.

For three years (1701–1704) success was divided. While Marlborough penetrated (1702) into the Low Countries, in spite of Boufflers, who, having to deal with two armies, was able only to manœuvre between them and to abandon without fighting

the towns of the Meuse as far as Namur, the marshal yet saved Alsace in the following year by defeating the Dutch at Eckeren. In 1701 Eugène descended upon Lombardy in spite of Catinat, who had superior forces but who was badly obeyed, even perhaps betrayed by some Spanish officers who failed to prevent the prince from debouching from Tyrol. Eugène, threatening the whole line of the Adige, had crossed that river without opposition at Castelbaldo in the plain while Catinat was waiting for him at Rivoli in the mountains. At the fight of Carpi (July 9) he forced the passage of the canal Blanc, where Catinat might still have checked him, and the marshal, disturbed by manœuvres as wise as they were bold, retired behind the Mincio and then behind the Oglio, leaving Milan open to the enemy. The court dismissed him and gave his army to Villeroy.

Villeroy: Defeat of Chiari (1701): Surprise of Cremona (1702).—Villeroy, a protégé of Madame de Maintenon, was a good courtier but a bad general. Catinat, who had consented to serve under him, raised objections. "It is not my nature to be circumspect," answered Villeroy, and repassed the Oglio, hoping to surprise Eugène at Chiari. The Duke of Savoy kept the imperialists informed of all the movements of the French. Villeroy, who was himself surprised, was defeated (September, 1701). But the enemy was unable to advance further than the stronghold of Mantua. Villeroy left Count Tessé to make a desperate defence and took up his winter quarters at Cremona. One day, while he slept in absolute security, he was aroused by sudden shots; he rose in haste, went out of his quarters, and fell into a squadron of Austrians. Eugène, in midwinter, had attempted a *coup-de main* on Cremona. He would have succeeded had it not been for a single regiment which at four in the morning had been assembled for a review by its colonel. The enemy, having reached the middle of the city, were driven out of its gates, but they carried the marshal with them (February, 1702). He was succeeded by Vendôme.

Victories of Vendôme at Luzzara: of Villars at Friedlingen and Hochstedt: of Tallard at Spires (1702–1703).—Vendôme, grandson of Henry IV., was a remarkable general of dubious morals, who never rose before four in the afternoon. But on the field of battle he showed a quickness of vision, a vivacity, a fire, which recalled Condé and Luxemburg; often surprised, never beaten, he maintained for two years a successful war against the imperialists. He first forced them to retire behind the Mincio,

thus delivering Mantua, and then, by a forced march, he captured their supplies at Luzzara on the right bank of the Po (1702). He then approached Tyrol. But at this moment the hidden treason of the Duke of Savoy developed into open defection, the Bourbons having unwisely refused to hand over to him the Milanese in exchange for Savoy (1703). Vendôme was forced to turn against him in order to ensure his communications with France; he took from him the greater part of Piedmont and threatened Turin, but he ceased to threaten Austria.

There was similar success in Germany. Catinat, called to the Rhine, did not restore there the reputation which had been compromised in Italy. He allowed the Prince of Baden to cross the river, take Landau, which sustained a siege of eighty-four days, Weissembourg, and Hagenau. A diversion by the Elector of Bavaria recalled the imperialists to Germany. Catinat, urged to pursue them, did not dare to do so, but Villars, one of his lieutenants, seized the opportunity. He attacked the Prince of Baden in the Black Forest, near Friedlingen, and gained his marshal's baton on the battlefield (October, 1702). A year later he shut up the Prince of Baden in the lines of Stolhoffen, left Tallard to watch him, and joined the Elector of Bavaria, who had on his side beaten the Austrians (May, 1703). The road to Vienna was open; Villars wished to take it and to assist the revolted Hungarians. Eugène declared later that had the army advanced, peace would have been made, and gloriously for France. Another manœuvre, which Bonaparte and Moreau tried later, was attempted and failed. The Franco-Bavarians entered Innsbruck, while Vendôme bombarded Trent. The two armies were to join hands across the Alps, but the defection of the Duke of Savoy recalled Vendôme from Tyrol and two imperial armies threatened Munich and forced Villars to abandon Innsbruck. He avenged himself on the Count of Styrum, who was completely defeated on the plains of Hochstedt (September, 1703). Two months later the imperialists suffered a bloody defeat near Spires which restored Landau to France, Tallard being the victor.

The Camisards.—This victory was the end of French success. Villars, unable to act with the elector, demanded his recall. Louis XIV. sent him against the Camisards, the revolted Protestants of the Cevennes. These unhappy people saw Clement IX. preach a crusade against them by a bull of May 1, 1703. Filled with terror they accepted the assistance of England and Savoy, who were eager to stir up civil war in the heart of France;

having been cruelly treated, they in their turn avenged cruelties cruelly. Villars was rigorous towards those who fought, indulgent to such as would submit. He won over one of their leaders, Cavalier, and in a single campaign restored practical peace in these provinces. But 100,000 persons had perished in this horrible war. Meanwhile Marsin had lost Germany.

Battle of Blenheim: Loss of Germany (1694).—Marlborough and Eugène had conceived an able and bold plan for saving Austria threatened by the capture of Passau in January, 1704. Eugène had left Italy, where the Duke of Savoy occupied the attention of Vendôme; Marlborough hastened from Flanders, where Villeroy was unable to keep him; and the two joined forces in Bavaria. Tallard and Marsin had united their forces with those of the elector, and together had 56,000 men against 52,000 on the side of the enemy. They thought that the allies would fall back and try to reach the left bank of the Danube and the two armies met near Blenheim. The dispositions of the French were unskilful; they formed their troops into two distinct armies. Marlborough easily forced his way between them, drove the right wing back on the river, cutting it off from the centre, and took Tallard prisoner. Marsin, in all haste, recrossed the Danube, leaving in the village of Blenheim a whole corps which had not fought and was forced to surrender. The disaster cost the French 12,000 dead or wounded, 14,000 prisoners, all their cannon, almost all their standards, and some hundred leagues of territory. In less than a month Bavaria was subdued; the elector, who had flattered himself that he would enter Vienna, fled to Brussels, and the imperialists reappeared on the Rhine. Villars was recalled to save Alsace. The marshal, who never considered modesty a necessary virtue, said to the king, "Make use of me, for I am the only general in Europe whose good fortune has been unvarying. God preserve me this luck for your Majesty's service."

Battles of Ramillies (1706), Turin (1706), and Oudenarde (1708); Loss of Italy and the Low Countries.—The empire was delivered; Eugène and Marlborough parted, the former returning to Italy and the latter to the Low Countries. The plan of the European alliance developed admirably under the direction of these two great generals. They resolved to conquer the outlying provinces of the Spanish monarchy as a prelude to an attack on France itself.

Marlborough was easily successful, since he had to contend with the incapable Villeroy. He penetrated into the heart of

Brabant and arrived near Mehaigne where the marshal had encamped. Villeroy's centre rested on Ramillies, a village which was to become famous and which lay near another having the same destiny—Waterloo. He might have avoided battle, but he was eager to restore his reputation and took all measures necessary to ensure his defeat. He placed half-trained recruits in the centre, left his baggage between the lines of his army, posted his left behind a marsh, as if he wished to prevent them from reaching the enemy. Marlborough quickly appreciated these blunders. The French could not attack his right; he weakened it and fell on Ramillies with superior numbers. Gassion, a lieutenant-general, who saw the plan, cried to Villeroy, "You are lost if you do not change your order of battle." He urged him to weaken his left and draw his lines closer, pointing out that delay would deprive him of the opportunity. Villeroy did nothing. The royal household troops, driven in on the right, laid the centre open, and the centre, attacked on the flank and rear, was dispersed (May, 1706). When Villeroy reappeared at court, the king contented himself with saying, "*M. le maréchal, on n'est plus heureux à notre âge.*"

The greater part of the Low Countries was lost as a result of this defeat, which cost the French 5000 killed or wounded and 15,000 prisoners. Marlborough entered Antwerp, Brussels, and Ostend, and Louis was forced, in order to check his advance, to recall Vendôme from Italy, where that general, after having driven the imperialists behind the Adige by his victories of Cassano on the Adda (August, 1705) and Calcinato near the Chiesa (April, 1706), was covering the siege of Turin directed by the Duke de la Feuillade. Feuillade was another Villeroy; his only merit was that he was son-in-law to Chamillart. Turin taken, Italy would have been in the power of the house of Bourbon, and vast preparations were made for its capture. Vauban, rich in years of glory, offered to attend the siege without a command. "I hope to take Turin in the manner of Cohorn," said Feuillade. This courtier's impertinence caused a French disaster. While Vendôme hastened to Flanders, Eugène, freed from his formidable adversary, conceived the bold plan of relieving Turin by moving up the right bank of the Po. He was obliged to cross fifteen rivers, to defeat or avoid the army of observation, to overcome the besieging force, and to do all these things with exhausted troops, inferior in numbers. Had there been a man in command of the French, Eugène would have been destroyed. But Marsin, who had been beaten at Blenheim,

was in command of the army of Italy. Vendôme, before his departure, had through carelessness allowed Eugène to cross the Adige and the Po ; Marsin, through incapacity, allowed him to cross the Parma, the Trebbia, the Bormida, and the Tanaro, and without trying to check his progress, he merely united his forces with those of Feuillade. The French lines before Turin, being too extensive, were forced (September, 1706), the marshal was mortally wounded, Piedmont delivered, the Milanese lost, and, as a consequence, in the following year the kingdom of Naples sacrificed.

Eugène and the Duke of Savoy, amazed at a victory which led them to the very gates of France, could not resist the temptation to cross the frontier. They invaded Provence by the Col-di-Tenda and laid siege to Toulon, being supported by an English fleet which commanded the sea. The city was well defended ; Eugène lost 10,000 men in the attack and subsequent retreat (August, 1707). Charles V. had already lost two armies in that same district ; an attack on this frontier has always been and should always be, owing to the nature of the district, fatal to those who make it. Victor Amadeus suffered a similar fate in the following year ; he invaded Dauphiné, which he coveted in order to round off Savoy, and was obliged to retreat in great haste.

Reverses in Spain (1704–1708).—Spain not only lost her outlying possessions ; she seemed to be likely to lose herself. In 1703 the English drew Portugal into the coalition and made this country almost a province of their own by the Methuen treaty. In 1704, the year of the defeat of Blenheim, they carried by a sudden attack the impregnable position of Gibraltar, which Blake in Cromwell's time had wished to seize. Since then it has always been held by England, with the result that she has been able to dominate the Mediterranean, a sea in which her flag had till then been almost unknown. The Archduke Charles, rival of Philip V., had at the same time landed in Catalonia with 9000 men. In 1705 he took Barcelona ; Aragon and the neighbouring provinces recognised him. In the following year, he entered Madrid ; the English took Cartagena, the Portuguese took Ciudad Rodrigo, and an Anglo-Portuguese army, commanded by Count de Ruvigny, a Protestant refugee, occupied Estramadura. In the councils of Louis XIV. the abandonment of Spain was mooted ; it was suggested that Philip V. should be sent to reign in America. A brilliant victory of Marshal Berwick at Almanza proved useless ; the archduke seemed to be secure

on his throne, and Pope Clement XI. wrote to him as "Our very dear son, King of the Spains" (1707).

Successes of Villars on the Rhine (1705–1707).—But Villars justified his boasting. In 1705 he had checked Marlborough and covered Lorraine. In the next year he relieved Fort Louis on the Rhine and in 1707 he forced the lines of Stolhoffen, which extended from Philippsburg to the Black Forest and which were regarded as the bulwark of Germany. From this position he was able to influence Franconia and Würtemberg, to levy contributions, and to prevent Marlborough from advancing too rapidly in Flanders. Thus the coalition, victorious at the two extremities of the vast line of operations, in Spain, in Italy, and in the Low Countries, was beaten in the centre on the Rhine. It was convinced of its powerlessness in the south by the failure of its attempts to invade France by the Rhône valley. The allies hoped to succeed better in the north and concentrated all their forces there.

At this time Charles XII. of Sweden was in Saxony with an army which had so far proved invincible. Villars proposed to march across the empire and join him; Louis XIV. urged him, on the ground of the long-standing friendship between Sweden and France, to play the part of Gustavus Adolphus and attack the coalition in the rear. Marlborough hastened to meet the Swedish hero. Germany was in a state of extreme anxiety, and the world watched breathlessly. The storm burst upon Russia and there spent its force uselessly.

Battle of Oudenarde (1708): France Invaded.—According to plan, Eugène joined Marlborough in Flanders. The campaign seemed destined to be decisive. France, believed by Europe to be exhausted, produced a new army of 100,000 men; the allies had 80,000. Louis XIV. entrusted the command to his grandson, the Duke of Burgundy, Vendôme acting as his lieutenant, whereas he should have been in sole command. The division of powers produced a further disaster; the army was routed at Oudenarde at the passage of the Scheldt (July 11, 1708). Oudenarde was not a great battle; rather an important affair of outposts which cost the French hardly 1500 men. A large part of the army was not engaged; when evening came, nothing had been lost, and Vendôme proposed to renew the battle on the following day. The Duke of Burgundy and his council refused to do so. "Then we must retreat, as you all wish it," cried Vendôme in anger. "Well, sir," he added, turning to Louis XIV.'s grandson, "you have long been envious." The retreat was as dis-

astrous as that of Turin. Regiments marched without order and without leadership; the enemy followed and killed or took 10,000 men. Ghent and Bruges surrendered; even Lille capitulated, despite the brave defence of Boufflers (October, 1708). France was open to the allies. A party of Dutch penetrated as far as Versailles, and on the bridge of Sèvres captured the king's first equerry, whom they mistook for the dauphin.

France and Spain begin to recover: Battles of Malplaquet (1709) and Villaviciosa (1710).—The winter of 1709 increased the misfortunes of France; the olives in the south, the fruit trees and corn in the north were frost-bitten and famine followed. The king's equerries were seen begging at the gates of Versailles, and Madame de Maintenon ate oat-bread. Louis XIV. humbled himself to ask for peace. But the *triumvirs* did not consider that he had been sufficiently humiliated. They demanded that he should give up Strasburg, renounce the sovereignty of Alsace, and aid in the expulsion of his grandson from Spain (May, 1709). "As it has to be war," he answered, "I prefer to fight my enemies than my children." He wrote to the provincial governors, bishops, and communes a letter in which he called on them to judge between his enemies and himself.

This noble appeal to patriotism moved all France. Those who had no bread became soldiers, and an army was formed as strong as that of the allies. Villars was given the command. At the Battle of Malplaquet it was seen that the war had become a national war. The allies had nearly 120,000 men and 160 cannon; Villars had 90,000 men and eighty pieces of artillery. When the battle began, the soldiers, who had had no bread for a day, came to receive it; many flung it away, so as to throw themselves more lightly into the fight. The enemy's left was almost routed, but Marlborough, on the right, bent the French line. Villars sent some reserves from the centre to the threatened point, charged at their head, and was wounded by a cannon ball which fractured his knee. The weakened centre was then vigorously attacked and the entrenchments which protected it were carried. Retreat was necessary. But the French had only lost 8000 men, while the allies had lost 21,000. The army fell back upon Quesnoy and Valenciennes, taking with them many enemy flags and standards, spoils which consoled Louis XIV. and made a defeat on the field a victory for honour (September 11, 1709).

This glorious defeat marked the end of French reverses. In the following year the allies suffered a real disaster. Louis sent Vendôme to Spain. The marshal had been in disgrace since

Oudenarde, but his name alone was worth an army. A crowd of volunteers gathered under him, and Philip V., who had not yet appeared on a battlefield, put himself at the head of his troops. The Spanish nation roused itself as the French had done at the voice of Louis XIV. The people of the country began that guerilla war which in the mountainous districts of Spain has always been fatal to invaders. The archduke's general, Count Staremberg, was completely defeated at Villaviciosa (December 9, 1710). After the battle, Vendôme said to Philip V., worn out with fatigue, "I will give you the fairest bed on which king ever lay," and made him a couch of the standards and flags taken from the enemy. This victory saved the crown of Philip V. One of its far-reaching results was that Canada, then threatened by a formidable expedition, was saved, the English army and fleet being kept on the coasts of Spain by Vendôme's success.

Defection of England from the Alliance (1711): Battle of Denain (1712).—The unexpected vigour shown by two peoples who were believed to be about to succumb astonished the allies. War-weariness spread among them, especially in England, whose subsidies had fed the coalition and on which the burden of the national debt of sixty millions sterling weighed heavily. A court intrigue hastened the event which public opinion, sovereign in a free country, was already preparing, and which the queen herself desired. The Duchess of Marlborough wearied Anne by her pride; she was disgraced, and with her fell her friends, the relatives of her husband, and soon the duke himself. Viscount Bolingbroke and the Earl of Oxford formed a new ministry, and the majority which they secured in the Commons, after a general election, proved that the nation itself accepted the change which was about to occur in the foreign policy of England.

Marlborough and the Whigs owed their influence to the war; the Tories, the new advisers of the crown, sought to found their credit on peace. In January, 1711, an unknown priest, Abbé Gauthier, who was in Bolingbroke's confidence, approached the Marquis de Torcy and without preamble said, "Sir, do you want peace? I can give you the means of making it." "You ask a dying man if he desires health," answered Torcy. Secret negotiations began; an unexpected event allowed them to become public. The Emperor Joseph I., who had succeeded Leopold I. in 1705, died on April 17, 1711, leaving no heir except his brother, the Archduke Charles. England had fought to prevent the union of France and Spain, and was not prepared to continue the war to unite Spain and Austria, to restore the

empire of Charles V. An armistice was soon arranged and the preliminaries of peace were signed in London, October 8, 1711. The allies followed this example; a congress was opened at Utrecht, January 29, 1712. The emperor and the empire refused to take part, but the forces on the two sides had now been equalised and a single campaign sufficed to prove to Germany that she could not without Europe defeat France.

Eugène was between the Scheldt and the Sambre with 100,000 men; he had taken Quesnoy in the gap which divided the two rivers. He occupied Bouchain on the upper Scheldt, and thus contained the garrisons of Valenciennes and Condé and he besieged Landrecies on the upper Sambre. That fortress served as a barrier against Maubeuge and Charleroi and Eugène with justice called his lines the road to Paris, since if Landrecies fell there was no fortress between his army and the capital. And even if he met with a reverse in this advance he would still retain for his retreat to the Low Countries the gate which he had opened. Enemy detachments were already ravaging Champagne; Reims had been threatened. Alarm was general in the kingdom; the king said to Villars, "My confidence in you is great, for I entrust you with the forces and safety of the state. I know your zeal and the strength of my troops, but fortune may be against them. If disaster occurs I shall go to Peronne or St. Quentin, rally there what may be left of my men, and make a last effort with you to save the state or die in the attempt." Whatever were the faults and pride of Louis XIV., much may be forgiven a prince who had so noble a confidence in his people and who was so devoted to the national honour. Rashness on the part of Eugène and fortunate boldness on that of Villars saved the king and France from such anxieties. The lines of the imperialists, twelve or fifteen leagues long, were too extensive and their divisions were too far apart to be able to give each other adequate support. Villars profited from this mistake; he occupied Eugène by a feint attack on the side of Landrecies, and marched rapidly upon Denain, where the Earl of Albemarle was posted. His men wanted hurdles to cross the ditches; "Our enemies' bodies shall be our hurdles," cried Villars. The camp was carried and seventeen battalions destroyed (July 24, 1712). Eugène hastened to the rescue; he was repulsed; all the positions along the Scarpe were successively carried (July 30); Landrecies was relieved; Douai, Bouchain, and Quesnoy were retaken; the frontiers of France and the glory of the king were safe (September to October).

Naval Expeditions: Duguay-Trouin.—During this war France was still less fortunate at sea. The need of keeping all her forces on land to make headway against Europe caused neglect of the navy. England profited from this and without effort gained possession of that empire of the seas which France abandoned and which Holland could no longer retain. The last naval battle fought under Louis XIV. was that of Vélez Malaga, where the Count of Toulouse with forty-nine vessels against fifty-five would have gained a brilliant victory if, instead of returning to Toulon after a ten hours' fight, he had renewed the attack on the Anglo-Dutch fleet, which was disordered and short of ammunition (March, 1705). From this time there were only squadron engagements and soon only running fights. The French colonies, left undefended, were devastated or conquered.

Some of the French privateers and captains still made names for themselves. Tourville, who with Duquesne was the greatest sailor of the reign, died in 1701. Jean-Bart, who had become the terror of English commerce in the last war, only survived a year. If Tourville had no successor, Jean-Bart found imitators in Forbin, who had long shared his adventurous life; Ducasse, from Béarn, Governor of San Domingo; Pontis, who took Cartagena in America with vast booty. Casart, who with a single ship fell into the midst of fifteen enemy vessels, fought for twelve hours, sank one English ship, dismasted two, and then escaped. "I would give all the deeds of my life for one of his," said one of the bravest French captains.

It was Duguay-Trouin who made this remark. The son of a shipowner of St. Malo, he was born in 1673, and spent his early years on his father's vessels. At eighteen he was entrusted with a ship of fourteen guns. From that day he every year made more adventurous voyages, more numerous captures, but the period of real naval war had passed before he was called into the navy, his captaincy dating from 1706. He had from this time only to engage in fights of ship against ship, to capture convoys, and to ravage the enemy coasts. He practised this type of war as Jean-Bart had done ten years earlier, but was able to play a more important part. He afforded proof of his capacity in his expedition against Rio de Janeiro (October 6, 1711), the vigour of his execution being equal to the boldness of his conception. Rio, which appeared to be impregnable, was taken in eleven days; sixty merchant-vessels, three men-of-war, two frigates, and a vast quantity of merchandise was taken or burned. The city suffered damage to the amount of twenty-five millions.

But the exploits of these sailors had no effect on the result of the war.

Success of Villars on the Rhine (1714): Treaties of Utrecht, Rastadt, and Baden (1713–1714). — The victory of Denain hastened the conclusion of peace. Three treaties were made: that of Utrecht (April 11, 1713) between France, Spain, England, Holland, Savoy, and Portugal; that of Rastadt (March 7, 1714) between France and the emperor; and that of Baden (June 7, 1714) between France and the empire. The Treaty of Rastadt was delayed for a year by the obstinacy of the Emperor Charles VI., who continued the war though abandoned by his allies. Villars, sent to the Rhine to meet Eugène, once more disconcerted the imperialists by the impetuosity of his attacks. He recovered Landau; stormed with his grenadiers, whom his bravery electrified, the mountain of Roskhof, the formidable lines of which covered Fribourg, and took that city. This success at last forced the emperor to accord to the nations that rest which for so long they had not known.

By these treaties Louis XIV. preserved the first conquests of his reign; Alsace, Artois, Roussillon, which had been gained under Richelieu and Mazarin; Flanders, where Lille was restored to him; Franche-Comté, Strasburg, Saarlouis, Landau; and in the colonies, the Antilles, Cayenne, Bourbon, and Senegal. He acquired the valley of Barcelonetta, but ceded to the Duke of Savoy Exilles, Fenestrella, and Château-Dauphin: to England, Newfoundland, with the great Hudson Bay fishery and its trade in furs; also Acadia, which, with its ports open all the year round, is the advance-post of Canada, where the French were now blockaded. He was obliged to demolish the fortifications and fill up the port of Dunkirk; he recognised the Protestant Elector of Hanover, George I., as presumptive heir of Queen Anne; he engaged to send out of France the Pretender, James Edward; to release from prison those of his subjects who had been imprisoned on religious grounds; he promised not to grant Spain any exclusive commercial privileges, while he did grant considerable advantages to England.

Philip V. preserved the throne of Spain and of the Spanish colonies, but renounced for himself and his heirs the crown of France. He ceded Gibraltar, an impregnable fortress, and Minorca, which possessed one of the finest ports in the Mediterranean, to England; Sicily to Savoy; the Low Countries, Milan, Naples, and Sardinia to the emperor.

The Duke of Bavaria, the unfortunate ally of Louis XIV.,

was restored to his lands. The electorate of Brandenburg, increased by the acquisition of Gueldres, became the kingdom of Prussia. The title of king was also given to the head of the house of Savoy. Finally the Dutch secured the right to garrison the chief places in the Austrian Netherlands to serve as a barrier against France, and until 1787 they were paid annually 1,250,000 florins by the Flemings to be their master.

These terms were honourable, if the humiliating proposals of the *triumvirs* at the Hague are considered, and still more the original hopes of the allies. France had saved herself by her perseverance, her strong unity, and the energy of her king; she had gained the last victory in the field, and she emerged from this terrible conflict weakened but not humiliated, and with the honours of war.

Two powers especially gained from the struggle. England acquired the empire of the seas; Austria gained vast domains in Italy and the Netherlands. Austria also regained Hungary, which was more necessary to her than Italy; England remained at Port Mahon, whence she watched Toulon, and at Gibraltar, whence she menaced Spain and guarded the entrance to the Mediterranean. But the Spaniards, having lost the Netherlands, lost also a permanent cause of war with France, and after being enemies for two centuries the countries now became allies.

Numerous Deaths in the Royal Family (1711–1714).—The last years of the reign of Louis XIV. were as sad as the first years had been brilliant. Personal misfortunes were joined to national misfortunes. He lost his only son, the dauphin (April, 1711); his second daughter (February, 1712), and her husband, the Duke of Burgundy (February, 1712); their eldest son, the Duke of Brittany (March, 1712), and the Duke of Berry, son of the dauphin (1714). Of his numerous family there remained only to Louis his grandson, Philip V. of Spain, and his great-great-grandson, the Duke of Anjou, then five years of age, who afterwards became Louis XV.

These many blows in succession decided the king to take a step which was a fresh assault on public morality. His legitimatised sons, the Duke of Maine and the Count of Toulouse, children of Madame Montespan, were declared heirs to the crown in default of princes of the blood. He included them, by his will, in the council of regency, of which his nephew, the Duke of Orleans, was only to be president. The Duke of Maine was to receive the guardianship of the young king and the superintendence of his education, while Villeroy was to be his governor.

Death of the King (1715).—Louis XIV. died on September 8, 1715, at the age of seventy-seven, after a reign of seventy-two years. He left France utterly exhausted. The state was ruined and there seemed to be no resource but bankruptcy. Before the War of the Spanish Succession Vauban had written, "Almost a tenth of the population is reduced to beggary; of the other nine-tenths, five cannot aid the tenth, being in a similar position; three-tenths are ill at ease; the remaining tenth, containing not more than 100,000 families, has only 10,000 who are comfortably off." The condition of affairs was worse in 1715 after a war during which money had been borrowed at 400 per cent., new taxes had been created, the revenue spent two years in advance, and the national debt increased to 2400 million francs, which would be to-day about 8000 millions.

The gain of two provinces, Flanders and Franche-Comté, and of some towns, Strasburg, Landau, and Dunkirk, was hardly enough to compensate for the fearful misery endured, and remembering the state of Europe in 1661, it must be concluded that Louis XIV. did not learn a lesson from it as he might have done. But children soon forget the sufferings of their fathers succeeding generations recalled only the victories; Europe defied; France all-powerful for twenty years; the incomparable glory of the court of Versailles; the marvels of literature and art which made the seventeenth century the *Age of Louis XIV.* History shows the price paid for the king's impossible attempt; an attempt to rule Europe which caused hatred, coalitions, disasters; an attempt to bend all wills to his own within France which led to the awful reaction of the next age.

CHAPTER LIII

GOVERNMENT OF LOUIS XIV.

Establishment of Absolute Monarchy. — If the administration of the kingdom was the work rather of the ministers of Louis XIV. than of the king himself, the general direction given to the government and society was due to Louis personally. With energy and ability, he ruled all others, annulling the powers of his subjects or forcing the use of those powers to the service of his greatness. No prince, in the opinion of St. Simon, possessed to a greater degree the art of reigning; his conception

of his sovereign rights was summed up in the phrase, to which, while he was still young, he gave utterance, " L'état, c'est moi."

He believed that he was the state and every one agreed with him. The Church accepted the dictum ; Bossuet founded the divine right of the monarchy on passages drawn from the Bible. " Kings, ye are gods," cried the great bishop, while Lebrun erected in Versailles the apotheosis of Louis. As long as the king lived there was in all France only one uncontrolled and unlimited will, the king's. " In that state, over which you will rule after my death, you will find no authority which is not derived from you and which does not owe to you its character," said Louis to his son.

Suppression of the States-General, of the Provincial States, and of Elective Mayors.—The States-General would have called to mind the rights of others ; they were never summoned. Those who spoke of them were punished, and when at the time of the Treaty of Utrecht, the allies, distrustful of his ambition, wished to secure the ratification of the peace by a national assembly, Louis haughtily refused and declared that he regarded the demand as an insult to the majesty of his throne. The majority of provinces had states of their own ; Louis suppressed them, preserving such assemblies only in Languedoc, Burgundy, Brittany, Provence, and one or two other districts, where the states continued indeed to meet, but only to execute the orders they received from the ministers. The remnants of municipal liberty were destroyed like that of the provinces. Disregarding the old rights, so dear to the towns, the king made the office of mayor hereditary and sold it to the highest bidder. An edict of 1683 placed the financial administration of the towns in the hands of the intendants. Municipal finance did not improve. Communities were made responsible for the payment of the *taille*, as the *curiales* had been under the Roman Empire ; the earlier financial policy had ruined the municipal magistrates ; the new exempted the magistrates but ruined the communes.

All this policy may be summed up in a few words, unhappily those of Colbert. " It is not good that one should speak for all," he wrote to a governor in a letter in which he ordered him to abolish an elective magistracy.

Municipal life was thus suspended in France, as political life had long been ; an unfortunate condition of affairs, since the country failed to acquire practical training in the art of administration. The result was that when she was forced to take the government from the weakened hands of her kings, she found

only bold and able logicians to guide her, instead of experienced men who would have known how to preserve continuity with the past by means of wise compromises. Political liberty, to be stable, must be firmly based upon local liberty. It is because it has been so based in England that it has grown and been preserved there.

Submission of Parliament.—The monarchy had for five centuries struck heavy blows at feudal aristocratic power, and to succeed the better in its conflict with the nobles it had itself created another caste, the judicial order. In the sixteenth century, the parliaments were termed the "strong and powerful columns upon which the monarchy is supported." But in the seventeenth century the new monarchy required no support other than its absolute right. Louis kept all parliaments subservient to his will; he placed them under the control of the Council of State, even the parliament of Paris which had given the regency to his grandmother and to his mother, and which had made the *Fronde*. By an edict of 1667 he ordered the registration of royal edicts within a week, and he allowed no protests. In the following year he deleted from the records of the body all the discussions which had taken place during the civil war, in order to destroy the very memory of the ancient claims of parliament. Finally he altered the title of the *sovereign court* into that of *superior court*, as if the original title had encroached upon the sovereignty of the crown (1665).

The magistrates reduced to administering edicts were yet forced to render services. D'Ormesson was disgraced for having resisted the wishes of the court during the trial of Fouquet; a judge who had refused to condemn the old *Frondeur* Fargues to death, on the ground that he held special letters of pardon, was replaced by another, more complaisant, who sent Fargues to the scaffold.

Submission of the Nobles.—The reduction of the nobles appeared to be more difficult. Richelieu had demolished their fortresses and had executed the more seditious. Mazarin had bought them or overcome them by craft. Louis XIV. made himself their master by attracting them to him by fêtes, by taking them away from their domains (where they too frequently remembered their ancestors and felt themselves still free) to fill his antechambers. His personal bodyguard was composed of those before whom his ancestors had trembled. Louis gathered together a brilliant retinue by which the "earthly representative of God" wished to be constantly surrounded. The governors of the

provinces deprived of all authority, which was transferred to the *intendants*, could no longer make kings. They had no longer the management of the revenues, or even the command of the troops; they were nominated for three years only, unless by their assiduity at Versailles they could secure the renewal of this empty honour. Those of the nobles who persisted in remaining on their estates were more than once compelled to endure a formidable visitation from the king's officials. Fléchier has preserved the memory of the *Grands jours de Clermont* held in 1665, and of the executions of the nobles of that province who fancied that the court was too distant for the complaints of the people to reach it. The king personally encouraged the severity of the magistrates. "Oppression and violence must be banished from the provinces on your circuit," he wrote to the president of the *Grands jours*. "You have begun too well not to make an end." He caused a medal to be struck, representing a released slave, protected by the royal glove, with the expressive inscription: *Salus provinciarum, repressa potentiorum audacia*. But for the nobles who resided at court, even for those who inspired a moderate esteem, there were constant honours in the shape of marks of consideration. The aim of Louis was to appear as the foremost among them all, and hence the greater in the eyes of the many.

If the nobles had titles and honours they had not the least political influence. Louis XIV. did not forget that the conqueror of Rocroi had possibly aspired to found a new dynasty, and he employed the princes of the blood as little as possible, even his own brother, for fear that they might win distinction. He attempted to encourage in them a taste for frivolity, which, in most instances, became a taste for disreputable pleasures. His brother might possibly have become a prince equal to the majority of princes; his nephew had perhaps the making of a remarkable man; the Prince of Conti was both brave and capable. They were compelled to spend in idleness or in debauchery the talents from which the country might have profited. He admitted into his council, after the death of Mazarin, only one man of the old nobility, the Duke de Beauvilliers, governor of the children of France, and he chose all his ministers from the ranks of those of moderate station, that he might be able, as St. Simon vigorously expresses it, "to hurl them back into that depth of obscurity from which he had drawn them." The great nobles were permitted only a limited share in the army and were obliged to submit to discipline at the

rough hands of Louvois and to the inflexible *ordre-du-tableau*. Even questions of honour and dignity, which they had been accustomed to decide quickly, sword in hand, were submitted to the Council of the Marshals, except in the case of dukes and peers. The French nobility had been unable to become, like the English nobility, a political class; it became merely a military caste.

The Third Estate.—Louis, following the old traditions of the monarchy, preferred to employ the middle class, which was better educated and more devoted, since its members did not yet realise the objections to absolute power and had for centuries experienced those of feudal government. To them Louis gave all financial, political, and judicial offices; he peacefully established the middle class in the government of the state, since all political activity was concentrated in the royal council and in the offices of the intendants. He urged the same class to engage in industry and commerce, two important activities of the new age; and by the regard which he had for these humble men, for Boileau, Racine, and Molière, he himself prepared that revolution which established the rights of the intellect at the expense of the rights of birth. He thus, of his own accord, paved the way for the evolution of the democratic France of the Revolution, as by his large armies and his victories he paved the way for the military France of the empire. But Louis XIV. must not be regarded as a kind of *bourgeois* king, a *roi-des-maltotiers*,[1] as St. Simon disdainfully calls him. His policy, his lofty idea of his personal dignity, that rigorous ceremonial which made of him a sort of redoubtable divinity, which made him so inaccessible; his banquets, his brilliant fêtes—none of all these suggest the more modest picture of a constitutional king. And the humble individuals whom Louis made his ministers, his ambassadors, his secretaries of state, left their original humble position when they entered the court. Louvois became a marquis, Pontchartrain a count, Torcy a marquis. While using middle-class servants, the grandson of Henry IV. still wished to be a king of gentlemen.

The Clergy: Declaration of 1682.—The clergy were treated like the nobles. They were honoured, but they were left no power. The great nobles, with few exceptions, were excluded from the Church as they were from the administration. The aristocratic St. Simon reproached Louis with having ruined the episcopate by filling it with pedants from the seminaries and

[1] King of tax collectors.

their pupils ; men without knowledge or birth, whose sole merit lay in their obscurity and boorishness, a strange rebuke in the mouth of one who was a contemporary of Bossuet, Fénelon, Fléchier, and Massillon, whose illustrious names are a perpetual honour to the Church of France.

The clergy, under Louis XIV., were a force making for the support of the monarchy. In the matter of the regalian rights the bishops supported the king even against the papacy. These regalian rights were the right of the king to receive the revenues of certain benefices, bishoprics, and archbishoprics during a vacancy. In 1673 an edict declared that this rule was to apply to all the sees in France. Two bishops refused to obey and were supported by the pope, Innocent XI. Louis, to end the dispute, called an assembly of the French clergy, which adopted in 1682, under the influence of Bossuet, four famous propositions. The first laid down that God had given to St. Peter and his successors no power, direct or indirect, over temporal affairs. The second declared that the Gallican Church approved the decrees adopted in the fourth and fifth sessions of the Council of Constance, by which general councils were declared to be superior to the pope in spiritual matters. The third laid down that the regalian rights, established in the kingdom and church, should be preserved unimpaired. The fourth stated that the decisions of the pope on matters of doctrine were unalterable only if approved by the Church.

The tribunals and theological faculties registered these four propositions, and it was forbidden to publish anything against them. Innocent XI. neither approved nor annulled the propositions, but he refused to grant bulls of investiture to bishops nominated by the government and to those who had been members of the assembly, with the result that at his death twenty-nine sees were without bishops. The matter was concluded only in 1693 when Innocent XII. granted the bulls of investiture and the king ceased to impose on the faculties of theology the obligation of signing the four propositions of 1682.

Protestants, Jansenists, and Quietists.—These disputes with the court of Rome did not benefit the dissentients. At the very height of the quarrel the king revoked the Edict of Nantes. He showed no more leniency towards the Jansenists, who were at variance on some points with the Roman Church. They owed their doctrines to a Bishop of Ypres, Jansénius, who died in 1638, and to the Abbot of St. Cyr, who had maintained some old opinions which seemed to be novel on the questions of pre-

destination and grace. Jansenism deserves to be remembered mainly on the ground of the character of the men by whom it was defended. The most illustrious among them, the great Arnauld, Lemaistre de Sacy, Nicole, and Lancelot, retired to Port-Royal des Champs, near Versailles, where Pascal also settled in 1654. There, living as solitaries, these puritans of Catholicism afforded to the world an example of constant toil of body and mind, of piety and of austerity, bordering on asceticism. They compiled, generally together, excellent books which are still used; they had illustrious pupils, Racine among others; and they won over to their views almost the whole magistracy. The spirit of political opposition was hidden under this religious opposition.

Louis XIV. frequently referred their opinions to the court of Rome, and as the sect would not submit to the decisions of the spiritual authority, he turned the power of the state against it, with a degree of severity which was regarded as excessive even at the time. In 1709 he ordered the destruction of Port-Royal; even the bodies buried there were dug up and thrown into the graveyard of a neighbouring parish. But the troubles continued, and were revived by a book written by Quesnel, a priest of the Oratory. A hundred and one of his propositions were condemned at Rome by the bull *Unigenitus*, which the king imposed upon all the clergy of France (1712). Those who opposed the bull were disgraced, imprisoned, or exiled. Quietism had the same fate. This was an ancient doctrine, revived and expanded by a woman, Madame Guyon. "It is necessary," she said, "to love God for Himself, with a love which is disinterested and pure, inspired neither by hope of eternal happiness, nor by dread of eternal pain." Fénelon, the former teacher of the Duke of Burgundy, Archbishop of Cambrai, appeared to defend this opinion in a book called *Maximes des saints*. Bossuet denounced the book in 1699. The pope, after long hesitation, condemned it. Fénelon submitted with the most Christian humility. He was in the pulpit when he received the brief which proscribed his doctrines; he left the sermon which he had prepared and preached on the obedience due to the Church in terms so touching and forceful that his defeat was admired almost as much as the victory of Bossuet.

Creation of a Police: Large Standing Army.—Two institutions assisted the king to establish this absolute power of the monarchy, the police and the army. The former was the creation of Louis XIV. In 1667 he established a magistrate with the duty

of supervising the police of Paris. This magistrate, Nicholas de la Reynie, was succeeded by the Marquis d'Argenson; they were the first lieutenants of police. They introduced better order, propriety, and security into the city. The system of public lighting was begun; from November 1 to March 1 a lantern in which a candle burned was placed at the entrance and in the middle of every street, there being a total of 5000 in Paris. The watch was instituted, rather than increased. Bodies of firemen replaced the Capuchins in the work of dealing with outbreaks of fire (1699). The narrow streets, often unpaved and irregular, were widened, cleaned, and paved; carriages and *fiacres* for the public were introduced. Pascal even conceived of the omnibus, which, however, was not then adopted. The custom of riding on horseback in Paris was kept up only by a few representatives of stubborn conservatism.

The police also served another purpose. They acted as censors; they intercepted the post and read suspect correspondence in what was later known as the *black cabinet*, and in order to free the government from the slowness of the ordinary forms of justice, they multiplied the *lettres-de-cachet*, by which all guarantees for the liberty of the individual were destroyed. This new power, employed to watch over persons and opinions, became an ever open, ever suspicious eye of monarchical power.

The army also served a dual purpose. It was employed against the enemy abroad and at home broke all resistance to the will of the king. During the War of the Spanish Succession its number exceeded 450,000. Large standing armies date from this reign; also schools of discipline, loyalty, and honour; all were a heavy burden on the national finances. This numerous army, which long enabled Louis to triumph over his foes, became within the kingdom, says Lemontey, "a supple, docile, ready instrument," which could be used without reserve in all branches of the administration. The troops were sent to the provinces to support the increase of the power of the intendants; in difficult times or in disaffected districts they aided by the terror which they inspired the collection of the taxes; they were finally employed in an extraordinary way to reconcile the consciences of dissenters to the true faith."

The Court.—All the orders in the state, all the authorities which existed in France, all conditions, parliaments, nobles, bourgeoisie, clergy, and dissenters were subjugated and dominated. Under the pressure of such authority the national character deteriorated. Vauban, Catinat, Fénelon resisted

the contagion. St. Simon, the inexorable judge in private, was a mute and submissive witness in public. Condé himself, despite his rank, services, and pride, became a courtier. Turenne alone was left in a position to speak truths to the king which others dared not utter, "being miserable grovellers."

This general condition of slavery showed itself most of all in the court, where Louis kept the nobles in gilded captivity. Versailles had been built with this design; all France was kept there under the eye and hand of the king. Those who did not live there were either of no account or were among the malcontent. Three conditions had to be fulfilled to win the favour of the king: to demand and secure a lodging at Versailles, to follow the court everywhere, even when ill or dying, and to approve of everything. During forty years, the Duke de la Rochefoucauld did not sleep twenty times away from the palace, but to his last hour he had his master's ear. Marquis Dangeau remained fifty years about the king, always in the same favour; the secret of his success was declared by Madame Maintenon to be the fact that he never blamed any one, that he always applauded. In this lay the road to graces and honours. Henry IV. sent back his nobles to their country houses; his grandson kept them in his antechambers. The old life of the great lord was a thing of the past; family life and connection with the land were gone for the nobles. They were left an artificial existence, in which certain qualities of mind developed, in which they lost all true dignity and all the virtues which belong to it.

At these splendid fêtes at Versailles, in the midst of all these artistic marvels, there blazed a society which was incomparable for its wit, elegance, grand manners. But the many errors of the king were lightly veiled. The first personages of the state, grave magistrates, illustrious prelates, dared not even protest by their silence or retirement against the scandal of doubly adulterous intrigues. The Duchess de la Valière secured pardon by her humility, her sweetness, and her eventual repentance. The haughty Montespan reigned longer over the court and king, despite the rivals whom she failed to overthrow. But she in her turn was at length supplanted by the Marquise de Maintenon, whom she had entrusted with the education of her children, and the widow of Scarron became the wife of Louis the Great (1685).

The trouble was not confined to the royal family. It threatened the state also, for Louis, violating all civil and religious law, placed by the side of the princes of the blood the legitima-

tised princes. He compelled the court to regard them as equals, and public morality received a blow which it long felt. The lessons in scandal given from the throne were not lost, and the spirit of corruption, which increased despite the apparent austerity of the last years of Louis XIV., blazed out without limit or shame under the succeeding reign. The Dukes of Orleans and Vendôme given over to debauchery, the Duke of Antin caught in the very act of theft, and many others who knew how to repair at cards the losses of fortune; the princesses of the blood who at Marly, close to the king and Madame de Maintenon, engaged in such strange pastimes; a court which, says St. Simon, "sweated hypocrisy" under a king turned pietist—all combine to prove that morality, conscience, and human dignity cannot be violated with impunity. Already, in the midst of Versailles itself, a warning cry was heard. "The nobles have no soul; I would be of the people," wrote La Bruyère, seeing this gilded vice. At Versailles, the nobles of France were destroyed. The boredom produced by the court led to secret debauches; compulsory piety produced impiety; the habit of receiving everything from the king led to the belief that everything was the price not of services, but of servility.

Signs of a New Spirit.—But a few great minds saw the clouds on the horizon and dared to offer respectful counsel. Vauban, who felt all the sorrows of the land, formed plans for their relief; he demanded the restoration of the Edict of Nantes and a return to religious toleration; he proposed to replace all taxes by a single impost, the royal tithe, payable by all, nobles and priests no less than commoners. When he presented his book to the king in 1707, Louis, forgetting the vast services of the marshal, condemned the book to the pillory. The patriotic ideas of a great citizen were received as the perverse imaginings of a sacrilegious dreamer. Six weeks later Vauban died.

Colbert had already died in despair. Racine fell into disgrace for an act of patriotism; it was less his religious opinions than his political ideas which secured for Fénelon that exile from which he did not return. But the opposition, stifled at home, found vigorous expression beyond the frontiers. As early as 1690, there were printed in Holland fifteen memoirs under the title *Les soupirs de la France esclave*, in which the old liberties of the country were demanded, the privileges of the three orders and the summoning of the States-General. These were the preliminary signs of that new spirit which in the eighteenth century was to agitate French society, after dual proof of the short-lived

benefits and far-reaching dangers attending that absolute monarchy of which Louis XIV. was the most striking personification.

CHAPTER LIV

THE AGE OF LOUIS XIV.

Literary Character of the Seventeenth Century in France.—The sixteenth century was the period of religious reformation, the eighteenth that of political reformation. Lying between these two revolutionary periods, the seventeenth century displayed in the realm of literature so perfect a harmony of mental force, a power of expression in such complete accord with the power of thought that it has remained for all time the golden age of French literature. Those who live in periods of stress, in the midst of violent discussions, see a more lofty and a deeper vision, but they do not attain that calm and serene beauty which posterity delights to contemplate.

The Age of Louis XIV. before Louis XIV.—It has been generally held that the king played an important part in the creation of this age of intellectual glory. But it is now known that before Louis assumed the reins of government France had already acquired a large part of that literary fame which the period had in store for her. Corneille, Descartes, and Pascal had produced their greatest works. Madame de Sévigné, La Rochefoucauld, Molière, La Fontaine, Bossuet were at their prime; the two great painters of the age, Le Sueur and Poussin, were dead or dying; and Boileau had written his first satire.

No one can become a great writer unless he is made so by nature, education, and circumstances. Genius asks of power only that it should not be stifled; authority cannot give genius a voice, though it can silence that voice. Authority can support genius, can rouse it by favour, still better by recognition, and Louis understood this and performed it admirably. This king, whose smile was regarded as a striking reward even for the most brilliant services, loaded Racine with marks of his esteem; he allowed Boileau to defeat him in a literary discussion; he permitted Mansart to talk to him at all times; and the nobles saw with astonishment the son of a weaver, the author of the *Misanthrope*, sit opposite the king at his table, an honour which the princes of the blood received only on the most solemn occasions of their lives.

The muses, in gratitude, gave to the king more than they received; they consecrated his name. At the present time, while realising that it is not every Maccenas who finds a Virgil, we preserve the phrase *The Age of Louis XIV.* to denote that period of French literature which extends from the first writings of Corneille to those of Voltaire. And we use the phrase because Louis had a real taste for the arts and for letters; because, though his favours assuredly did not create a single great writer, yet by honouring letters they prepared the way for the establishment of their empire.

The Academies and Pensions.—Louis XIV. did not regard literature as a power, and in his time it had not become so. But he regarded it as a necessary ornament, as a luxury worthy of a great king. He favoured letters while keeping them under control and during his reign there was established that real government of literature which Richelieu had inaugurated. Colbert was the minister employed on this work. By founding the academies he attempted to organise worthy temples of the mind and of learning, in which the rules of literature should be drawn up, its tone decided, and its limits set. The members of these bodies were in a sense public functionaries, their pensions and rewards for attendance were their salaries. The Academy of France continued to prepare the dictionary of the language, and to accelerate this work Colbert prescribed the hours of their meetings. The Academy of Inscriptions prepared devices for medals and escutcheons, and inscriptions for the monuments, the decoration of which was arranged by the Academy of Painting and Sculpture. The province of the Academy of the Sciences was defined by the wording of the medal struck at the time of its foundation, *Naturae Investigandae et perficiendis artibus.*

The academies formed corporations of literature, science, and art. Their most eminent members had official functions and a rank at court. Jules Mansart was first architect and superintendent of the royal buildings; Lebrun was first painter; Lulli was first musician. Louis XIV. did not give poetry an office at court; he was content to bind it to him by favour. Such a post, however, was granted to history, that the judgment of posterity might be assured in advance. Racine and Boileau were the historians. Even Molière, his valet-de-chambre, played a part in that great piece which was performed so gravely round the king at Versailles. Louis, who made his nobles ascend the triumphal car of monarchy, readily allowed the poet to direct his bitter sarcasms at them from below, and on occasion

would draw his attention to something disgraceful which he had forgotten, a marquis whom the immortal comedian had not struck.

Prose Writers.—"In eloquence, in poetry, in literature, in books both moral and entertaining," says Voltaire, "the French have been the lawgivers of Europe. True eloquence was everywhere ignored, religion was made ridiculous in the pulpit, causes were made ridiculous at the bar. Preachers quoted Virgil and Ovid; advocates quoted Augustine and Jerome. No genius was found who could give to the French language power, measure, style, and dignity. A few verses of Malherbe suggested that force and grandeur were not alien from it, but that was all. The same men who wrote so well in Latin, men like the President de Thou, the Chancellor l'Hôpital, were no longer the same when they turned to their own tongue, which proved rebellious in their hands. The French were recommended as writers only by a certain *naïveté* which formed the merit of such authors as Joinville, Amyot, Marot, Montaigne, Regnier, and the author of the *Satire Ménippée*.

"Jean de Lingendes, Bishop of Macon, was the first orator who spoke with really good taste. His sermons, though still marked by the rust of ages, were the model for those later orators who imitated and surpassed him. The funeral oration on Victor Amadeus, Duke of Savoy, pronounced by Lingendes in 1637, was full of passages of great eloquence, so that, long afterwards, Fléchier borrowed the whole introduction as well as many other passages to adorn his famous funeral oration over Turenne."

"Balzac (1594–1654) gave rhythm and harmony to prose. It is true that his letters were bombastic harangues; he wrote to Cardinal de Retz, 'You are about to take the sceptre of kings and the livery of roses.' With all his faults Balzac charmed the ear; eloquence has charmed men at all times and he was admired because he had discovered some small part of an art, unknown but necessary, the harmonious choice of words, and he was not admired the less that he often employed words wrongly. Voiture (1598–1648) had some idea of the light grace of that epistolary style; but his letters are inferior since they consisted only of pleasantries. His two volumes of letters are two volumes of jests, with no trace of that depth of feeling which makes it possible to depict the manners of a period, the period itself, and the character of men. His work was in a manner an abuse of capacity." Voltaire is here too severe. Voiture had

something better than brain ; he possessed probity, courage, a lofty heart, and, like Voltaire himself, was able to force the great to reckon with him. As a writer his reputation is poor and there is no need to attempt to enhance it, but it is something to find another honest man in history, and Voiture was such a man. A judge enabled him to secure from a lawsuit more than was due to him ; Voiture repaid his opponent. One of his friends was robbed : " Have the honest fellows had the politeness to leave you a little money ? Fearing that they have not done so, I send you these hundred pistoles, and you may have twice that amount if you need it."

" One of the works," says Voltaire, " which most contributed to form the taste of the nation were the short *Maximes* of Francis, Duke of La Rochefoucauld (1613–1680). Though there is only one truth in the work, that " amour propre est la mobile de tout," yet this idea is presented under so many varied aspects that it is always striking. It is less a book than materials for adorning a book. It is greedily read. It causes thought and its ideas are expressed in a manner vivid, clear, and delicate. But the first work of genius in prose was Pascal's *Lettres Provinciales* (1657). All kinds of eloquence are there united. To this work the fixing of the language was due ; there is hardly a word which has suffered any change of meaning, though in a living tongue such changes are so frequent. The Bishop of Lucon, son of the famous Bussy, asked Bossuet what work he would soonest have produced after his own ; the answer was *Les Lettres Provinciales*.

" One of the first to exhibit eloquent reasoning power in the pulpit was Father Bourdaloue (1632–1704) about 1668. He was a new light and was followed by other pulpit orators, such as Father Massillon (1662–1742), Bishop of Clermont, who introduced into their sermons more grace, finer and more illuminating pictures of the manner of the age, but whose memory has not survived. In his style, nervous rather than florid, without any imagination in his expression, Bourdaloue seemed rather to convince than to move ; and he never strove to please." But in him there may be observed boldness in censuring contemporary morals. " M. Bourdaloue's sermons caused the courtiers to tremble owing to their power ; he struck like a tempest," says Madame de Sévigné.

" Bourdaloue had been preceded by Bossuet (1627–1704), afterwards Bishop of Meaux. He who became so great a man had preached before the king and the queen-mother (1661) long before Bourdaloue was known. His sermons, illustrated by noble

and moving gestures, were the first to be heard at court which bordered on the sublime. They met with great success and the king wrote to the preacher's father to congratulate him on the possession of such a son. But when Bourdaloue appeared Bossuet was no longer regarded as the first preacher. He had already preached various funeral orations, a species of eloquence which demanded a degree of imagination and a majestic grandeur akin to poetry. The funeral oration on the queen-mother (1667) secured him the see of Condom, but that sermon was unworthy of him and was not printed in the collection of his discourses. The funeral oration on the Queen of England, the widow of Charles I. (1669), was almost his greatest achievement. That on Madame, cut off in the flower of her age and dying in his arms, had the greatest and most singular success, since it caused the court to weep. The preacher was forced to stop at the words: '*O nuit désastreuse, nuit effroyable, où retentit tout à coup comme un éclat de tonnerre, cette étonnante nouvelle, Madame se meurt! Madame est morte!*' The church resounded with sighs; the voice of the preacher was drowned in sobs and lamentations. The French alone succeeded in this form of eloquence. Some time later Bossuet invented another type of eloquence which was successful only in his hands. He applied the art of oratory to history, from which it appeared to be divorced. His *Discour sur l'Histoire Universelle*, composed for the instruction of the dauphin, had never been anticipated and was never imitated. The majestic power with which he describes manners, governments, the rise and fall of great empires, is astonishing; not less amazing are the rapid and yet vigorously true passages in which he paints and judges the characters of nations. Almost all the works which adorned this age were of a kind unknown to antiquity. The *Télémaque* is one of the number. Fénelon (1651–1715), the disciple and friend, afterwards, despite himself, the rival and enemy, of Bossuet, composed this curious work, which was at once a romance and a poem, in which rhythmic prose takes the place of verse. He apparently wished to treat romance as Bossuet treated history, giving it an unknown dignity and charm, and above all drawing from his fictions a moral valuable for mankind. He composed this book to provide essays and instruction for the Duke of Burgundy, whose tutor he was. Full of the learning of the ancients and born with a lively and tender imagination, his style was essentially his own and flowed as from a never-failing source. In his original manuscript there are not ten erasures. It is said that a servant stole a copy from

him and caused it to be printed; if this be so, that breach of trust gained for the Archbishop of Cambrai his whole European reputation, though it possibly destroyed his reputation at court. In *Télémaque* there may be found an indirect criticism of the government of Louis XIV. Sésostris, who triumphed too extravagantly; Idomeneus, who established luxury in Salentum and forgot the necessaries of life, both afforded portraits of the king. In the eyes of the malcontent, Louvois appeared to be represented as Protésilas, vain, harsh, proud, the foe of the great captains who served the state and not the minister. Among productions of a unique character may be counted the *Caractères* of La Bruyère (1644–1696). There is no example of this kind of work among the ancients. A rapid, concise, nervous style, picturesque expressions, an entirely novel use of language, which broke rules but attracted the public, and allusions which the vulgar could follow, secured the success of the book. Malezieu remarked when Bruyère showed him the manuscript that the work would win many readers and many foes. The book lost its standing when the whole generation attacked in it had passed away, but it will never be forgotten, since there are in it things which belong to all time and all places."

At this time there was one special class of writers, those who related what they had seen or done. Thanks, perhaps, to a trait in the national character which leads Frenchmen to wish to discuss themselves with their contemporaries and with posterity, to secure the verdict of the future beforehand, France has always been the great land of memoirs. This curious branch of literature dated from a relatively early period beginning with Joinville and Villehardouin. The seventeenth century produced a rich collection of these works, written in most cases with fine and delicate spirit, and revealing very clearly the secret history and causes of events. Those of Richelieu are a mine of valuable material for the general history of the age; those of Madame de Motteville (1621–1689), the confidante of Anne of Austria, make us intimate with that princess. Abbé de Choisy (1644–1724), who lived a very adventurous and not wholly blameless life, wrote memoirs to assist in the writing of a history of Louis XIV. Paul de Gondi, Cardinal de Retz (1614–1679), left a book which is one of the monuments of the language and which will always be read with pleasure though the author may not always be believed. Gourville (1625–1703), receiver-general of the *taille* in Guienne, a man of vast wealth quickly acquired, who shared in the fall of Fouquet, wrote memoirs of the years 1642 to 1678; Pierre

Lenet, councillor of the parliament of Dijon, wrote on the period of the *Fronde*. The great nobles also indulged frequently in this type of literature. Under the regency of Anne of Austria there were the memoirs of La Rochefoucauld, which caused a great scandal when they appeared; on the last part of the reign of Louis XIV. and for the first part of that of Louis XV. there are the twenty volumes of St. Simon, who was not a Tacitus but who was a prolific writer.

Poets.—Regnier and Malherbe belong to the previous period, since the former died in 1613 and the latter in 1628. Rotrou is well in the seventeenth century (1609–1650), but hardly anything of his is now read except his tragedy *Wenceslas*. With Corneille the masterpieces begin to appear in numbers, raising the French to the level of the Greek theatre. "Pierre Corneille (1606–1684)," says Voltaire, "was the more to be admired because he was surrounded only by bad models when he began to produce his tragedies. The path to excellence was barred still further by the fact that these bad models were esteemed, and to complete the discouragement they were favoured by Richelieu, who was the protector of men of letters rather than of good taste. Corneille had to contend with his age, his rivals, and the cardinal, who decried *Le Cid* and disapproved of *Polyeucte*. Corneille formed himself as a writer; Louis XIV., Colbert, Sophocles, and Euripides combined to form Racine (1639–1669). An ode which he wrote at the age of twenty won him an unexpected prize and resolved him to devote himself to poetry. His reputation increased daily, while that of Corneille tended to decline. The reason was that Racine in all his works after his *Alexandre* was always elegant, always correct, always true, speaking from the heart, whereas Corneille failed in all these duties. Racine far surpassed the Greeks and Corneille in his appreciation of human passions, and he brought the sweet harmony of poetry and the grace of language to a higher point than any of his predecessors. A considerable party piqued themselves on never doing justice to Racine. Madame de Sévigné (1626–1696), the leader of her age in the art of letter-writing, always declared that he would not go very far; she talked of him as of a café, of which she said *qu'on se désabusera bientôt*. It takes time for a reputation to become assured. A curious destiny made Molière (1622–1673) the contemporary of Corneille and of Racine. It is not true that when Molière appeared he found the theatre absolutely without good comedies. Corneille himself had produced *Le Menteur;* and Molière had published only two of his great works when

La Mère coquette of Quinault appeared, a piece which has both character and intrigue and is a model of the latter. This was in 1664; it was the first comedy in which those who were known as the marquises were depicted. The majority of the great nobles of the court of Louis XIV. tried to imitate their master's grand air, his éclat and dignity. Those of a lower rank imitated their superiors, and there were those, and many of them, who carried this haughty manner and self-assertion to an absurd point. This affectation lasted a long time. Molière often attacked it and helped to laugh down these self-important nobodies, as well as the affectations of the *précieuses*, the pedantry of the *femmes savantes* and of the lawyers, and the Latin of the doctors. Molière was in fact the lawgiver of good manners; this was his service to his own age, and he rendered services also to all ages. This period is worth the attention of all time, when there appeared the heroes of Corneille and Racine, the characters of Molière, the symphonies of Lulli—all new to the nation; when the voices of Bossuet and Bourdaloue were heard by Louis XIV., by Madame, so famous for her taste, by a Condé, a Turenne, a Colbert, by that crowd of great spirits who then appeared in every walk of life. There will never again be a time when a Duke de la Rochefoucauld, author of the *Maximes*, will leave a conversation with a Pascal and an Arnaud to attend a play by Corneille. Despreaux (1636–1711) raised himself to the level of these great men not by his early satires, for posterity reads only *Les Embarras de Paris*, and remembers only the names of Cassagne and Cotin, but by his *Épîtres* and his *Art Poétique*, from the latter of which Corneille learned much. La Fontaine (1621–1695), less chaste in his style, less correct in his language, was unique in his *naïveté* and his peculiar graces, and by his simplicity placed himself almost on a level with these great men."

Philosophy.—Philosophy was given a new lease of life by Descartes (1596–1650), less by what he taught than by what he destroyed. His system has fallen, as do all philosophical systems; his method remains, and is the most powerful arm for the combating of error and for the discovery of the truth. Descartes accepted as true only that in moral and physical science which seemed evident to reason, which evidence he placed, in philosophical matters, in the irresistible position of a manifestation of consciousness. In his *Discours de la Méthode* (1637), written in that clear style which marks contemporary French prose, and in his *Méditations* (1641) he tried to prove by the aid of reason

alone that God exists, that the soul is spiritual and immortal, that the human will is free and that man is therefore a responsible being. His principles were adopted by the most religious minds of the age; they inspired Malebranche, who was called the French Plato, in his admirable work *La Recherche de la Vérité;* Bossuet in his *Traité de la Connaissance de Dieu et de soi-même;* and Fénelon, in his eloquent *Démonstration de l'existence de Dieu.* Thus in the seventeenth century France founded speculative philosophy in opposition to the empiricism which triumphed in England with Bacon and Locke; as in the eighteenth century she defended experience against the cloudy metaphysics of Germany, going on, step by step, guided always by her own clear light of reason, along the highways which Plato and Aristotle opened to the world, and leaning, to restore equilibrium, to that side which the exaggerations of other nations endangered.

Pascal (1623–1662), another great mind, was also a great writer in his *Lettres Provinciales* (1656), directed against the loose morals of the Jesuits, and his *Pensées,* fragments of a work which he proposed to write on the truth of Christianity. Pascal was less an inventive genius like Descartes, despite his great discoveries, than a critical genius of very great power. With Pascal must be mentioned his friends the pious recluses of Port-Royal, minds intensely earnest, if somewhat narrow, who founded in the midst of Catholicism an energetic and vigorous sect which Louis XIV. persecuted and which revived theological quarrels in the mid-eighteenth century. The chief Jansenist doctors were Le Maistre de Sacy (1612–1694), who translated the Bible in the Bastille where the Jesuits kept him for three years; Antoine Arnaud (1612–1694), called Le grand Arnaud, whose life was one long theological discussion with the Jesuits, the Protestants, and Malebranche. Nicole (1625–1695) is known chiefly by his *Essais de Morale;* Lancelot, by his works on education. Far removed from this current of ideas, Bayle and La Mothe le Vayer continued the sceptical tradition of Montaigne and Rabelais, which was to be resumed by Voltaire.

Erudition.—Some mention must be made of those laborious minds who continued to reveal the history of antiquity or to unravel the chaos of the early periods of France. Their influence on the language was slight or non-existent, for in general they were not writers, and the majority of their works were in Latin, but they influenced thought considerably, since the right understanding of the past makes the present more easily com-

prehended. They further pursued a species of truth, that of history, and their works still guide us. The greatest of these savants were Casaubon, Scaliger, Saumaise, Ducagne, Baluze; various Benedictines, such as Mabillon and Montfaucon; and the Protestant, Bayle. Mézeray (1610–1683), author of a "history of France to the time of Louis XIII.," of more value for its style than for its matter, strove to win a place among the writers, and succeeded. Father Daniel (1649–1728) revised the work of Mézeray without consigning it to oblivion; Abbé Fleury (1640–1723) wrote an ecclesiastical history which is still regarded as of merit; also the *Mœurs des Israelites;* Le Nain de Tillemont (1637–1698) left a learned history of the Roman emperors. Finally there were the orientalists Bochart, d'Herbelot, Galland, and the travellers in the East, Le Vaillant, Chardin, Bernier, who restored to Europe knowledge of a world unknown since the crusades.

Literary Influence of France.—No nation in Europe could at that time present so magnificent an array of literary productions. Italy and Germany were sunk in moral decadence. Spain, like a rich ruin which preserves nothing save precious relics of its lost fortune, produced only eminent painters and over-prolific writers. England had produced Shakespeare at the beginning of the age, Milton in the middle, and Dryden at the end of the century, but no literature now came from that island. France, on the other hand, was really at the head of civilisation, and by the recognised superiority of her intellect and her taste, she caused all Europe to accept the peaceful sway of her artists and writers.

Sciences.—In the realm of science, France was in the midst of the movement, but did not lead it. If she had Descartes and Pascal, other nations produced Kepler, Galileo, Newton, and Leibnitz. Antiquity and the Middle Ages had cultivated with success the science of reason, but the study of the physical world was sterile since the true methods of experiment were not known. They could not become known until the belief had been established that the universe is governed by the immutable laws of an eternal wisdom and not by the arbitrary whims of capricious powers. Then alone could the human mind be acquitted of the charge of sacrilegious daring, *Gens humana ruit per vetitum nefas,* when men strove to read the secrets of creation. Alchemy, magic, astrology, all the follies of the Middle Ages developed into the sciences as soon as man no longer concerned himself with the impenetrable essence of things, and instead of considering iso-

lated phenomena, endeavoured to grasp the laws by which those very phenomena were produced. This period of human thought began with Copernicus in the sixteenth century, but it was only in the seventeenth that the revolution was triumphantly accomplished with Kepler, Bacon, and Descartes. Descartes gave an immense impetus to the study of algebra by inventing the notation of powers by numerical exponents and to the geometry of curves, which enabled him to solve hitherto insoluble problems. He found the true law of refraction; with Galileo, he believed in the revolution of the earth round the sun, and as even the errors of genius bear fruit, his chimerical theory of vortices—according to which the sun and fixed stars were the centre of so many vortices of matter, round which the planets circled—was the germ of the celebrated Newtonian theory of attraction. For Descartes, as for Newton, the problem of the physical universe was a mechanical problem, and Descartes, though he failed to discover the solution of the problem, was at least the first to indicate its true nature. Pascal discovered the elements of geometry unaided and with no books at the age of twelve; at sixteen he wrote his treatise on conic sections. A little later he invented the calculus of probabilities, demonstrated the weight of the air by his famous experiment on the Puy-du-Dôme, contrived the dray and perhaps the hydraulic press. Round these great men there was a numerous crowd of imitators. Pierre Fermat (1601–1665), councillor of the parliament of Toulouse, printed nothing, but was possibly the great mathematical genius of the age. He shared with Descartes the glory of having applied algebra to geometry, and devised the method *de maximis et de minimis* at the same time as Pascal created the calculus of probabilities. Abbé Mariotte (1650–1684) recognised that the volume of a gas at a given temperature varies in inverse ratio to the pressure to which it is subjected. Denis Papin, born at Blois in 1647, created or perfected many machines, and was the first to think of employing steam as a motive force. In Germany, on the Fulda, he made some experiments with a steamboat which ran up stream. Some stupid sailors destroyed the great physicist's machine, and Papin died in London in want (1710).

Geography was reformed by Nicholas Sanson (1600–1667) and by William Delisle (1675–1726), whose maps are still esteemed. Tournefort (1656–1706) restored botany and enriched the royal gardens with rare plants, which he had collected during a voyage in the Levant. The royal printing press equalled the

Dutch presses in the correctness and elegance of the editions produced. Finally in surgery the traditions of Ambroise Paré were continued. People came from all over the continent to consult Félix and Maréchal at Paris.

Three strangers whom Colbert attracted to France justified by their work the royal favour. The Dane Roemer determined the speed of solar rays; the Dutchman Huygens discovered the rings and one of the satellites of Saturn; the Italian Dominic Cassini discovered the other four moons of that planet. Huygens was responsible also for the invention of the pendulum clock, and Cassini was the first to begin the calculation of the size of the earth. He conducted his experiments in this regard with Abbé Picard, professor of astronomy in the College of France, and the two began in 1669 the meridian which was later extended as far as Roussillon. It was according to the measure of a degree given by Picard that Newton was able to calculate the force which kept the moon to its orbit. The observatory was constructed at Paris specially for the work of Cassini.

Arts: Painting.—The intellectual development of a people proceeds at once on all sides; when the age of great writers has arrived that of great artists is not far distant. This species of moral infection, which spread to all the great minds of the period and excited all those of superior talents, was too vigorous in the seventeenth century for artists not to be found side by side with the writers. Yet except in painting, the sixteenth, rather than the seventeenth, century is the great age in France. There is nothing among the monuments of the reign of Louis XIV. to compare with the central portion of the palace of the Tuileries, with the old Louvre, with part of Fontainebleau, or with the châteaux of the period of Francis I. and Henry II.

There were four painters of the first rank, Poussin, Le Sueur, Claude Lorraine, and Lebrun; one admirable sculptor, Puget; architects of some talent, Mansart and Pérrault; and one able musician, Lulli.

Poussin lived for a long time at Rome and had the reputation of being the greatest artist of the period, a reputation which he has kept. Despite the fact that his colouring was too sombre, he remains the head of the French school in respect of his moral elevation, the dramatic interest of his works, the richness and poetry of his compositions, and for that search for the ideal which he himself called "the chief joy of intellect." It may be added that he was also pre-eminent for the purity of his life, a quality which is not alien from art. He despised fortune, honours, the

advances of the great, and shut himself away with his noble thoughts and his arts, as he depicted his Diogenes in the midst of the most magnificent scenes of nature, rejected by the philosopher as a final futility. Le Sueur, Lebrun, and Mignard may be regarded as his pupils, for they received his lessons and advice for many years. Poussin belonged to Les Andelys in Normandy, and died at the age of sixty-two (1665). Le Sueur was born in Paris, lived poor and obscure, and died at the age of thirty-eight (1655), not, as has been said, in the Carthusian convent for which he painted his beautiful series of twenty-two pictures representing the life of St. Bruno, but near the Hôtel Lambert, which, in company with Lebrun, he decorated with paintings still to be seen. He had a gentle and open disposition; his paintings were always gracious, even when dealing with the most severe subjects, owing to the softness of tone and delicacy of drawing, expressing to perfection the feelings and even the most intimate affections of men and women. His rival, Lebrun, born in Paris two years later (1619), was quite different in temperament, and his talent, often theatrical, was more to the taste of Louis XIV., who appointed him his first painter and employed him to decorate Versailles, a task on which the artist was engaged for fourteen years. Lebrun was, until the death of Colbert, the arbiter and even the dictator of art in France; nothing was done except according to his designs and in conformity with his opinion; his influence, and even his work, can be traced in all the paintings of the time. His drawing was weak and heavy, the expression of his faces was rather exaggerated than true; he had neither the splendid colouring of Titian, nor the natural grace of Le Sueur, nor the spirit of Rubens, nor Poussin's depth of thought. But he was an artist of merit, the first among those of the second rank. The foundation of the French school at Rome was due to him; to that school the young artists who have won what is known as the "grand prix de Rome" are sent at the expense of the government to complete their studies amid the masterpieces of antiquity and of the great Italian painters. With these four masters a place must be found for Philip de Champagne, who has left some admirable portraits and one masterpiece, *L'Apparition de St. Gervais et de St. Protais;* for Mignard (1610–1695), who was for some time the rival of Lebrun on the score of his great fresco, the *Val-de-Grâce*. But posterity does not give him so high a place; affectations of delicacy and grace are called, in reference to him, *la mignardise*. Claude Gelée, called Lorraine, was born in Lorraine in 1600

and died at Rome in 1632. He was the best French landscape painter and one of the first in Europe. He was the artist of light; his richness of style and beauty of colouring in landscapes and seascapes may be admired at the Louvre where they are preserved. Mention must also be made of Jouvenet de Rouen (1647–1717), a pupil of Lebrun, painter of *Esther devant Assuérus* and *Une pêche miraculeuse;* Santerre (1651–1717), who painted the beautiful *Sainte Therese* in the chapel of Versailles; La Fosse, who painted the dome of Les Invalides and the vault of the chapel of Versailles, on which the two brothers Bon Boullóngne and Louis Boullongne also worked; Lemoine, of the salon d'Hercule; and above all Watteau of Valenciennes (1684–1722), who inaugurated the genre style, but with brilliant colours.

Sculpture and Engraving.—Puget, like Michael Angelo, whose pride and energy he equalled, was at once painter, sculptor, and architect. He was born at Marseilles in 1622 and died in 1694. For a long time he carved figures in wood for the poops and galleries of the ships of Toulon, built many fine houses in the Rue Cannebière, and filled Genoa with his masterpieces. Louis XIV. commanded from him the groups of the *Persée* and *Milon de Crotone*. This last marble rivals the works of antiquity in its energy of expression and in its truth of design, save that one cannot find in it that nobleness of form which the artist ought never to forget even when he depicts material strength. The mighty athlete, so many times crowned by all Greece, should show by the sorrow of his face the memory of past victories. Puget was too independent to succeed at Versailles. He went there and was well received, but with difficulty secured for his *Milon* the cost of the marble. His bas-relief of Diogenes and Alexander, despite the skill which it shows, was only a proof of the powerlessness of sculpture to rival painting. The marble clouds and flags hang heavily, whereas in painting they float lightly; and the chief actor is missing in the sculpture—that ray of sunlight which the conqueror intercepted. Puget left no pupils. Coysevox, the two Coustou, Girardon, followed a different system; they were rather sculptors of grace, masters of a brilliant and facile style without elevation. The Tuileries received from Coysevox *Les Chevaux ailés* which decorate the entrance on the side of the Place de la Concorde; *Le Fluteur*, *La Flore*, and *L'Hamadryade* which are in front of the château; and from Nicolas Coustou, *La Seine*, *La Marne*, *Berger chasseur*, and *Jules César;* from William Coustou, *Hippomène* and *Atalante*, while the *Chevaux indomptés* at the entrance of the

Champs Elysées are by the same artist. Girardon peopled Versailles with his works; the mausoleum of Richelieu is his masterpiece. The engravings of Callot, Nanteuil, and Audran are to be found throughout Europe.

Architecture.—Francis Mansart forsook the elegance and grace of the Renaissance for a style which he believed to be majestic but which was merely heavy. He began the Val-de-Grâce, built the château of Maisons near St. Germain-en-Laye, and invented the mansard roof. His nephew, Jules Hardouin Mansart, was a cold and regular genius, who almost attained to grandeur of design since Louis stinted him neither in space, nor money, but who seemed to lack inspiration and elegance save in his beautiful cupola of Les Invalides. Claude Pérrault (1628–1688) was a doctor, a surgeon, and a great architect; he had a great reputation in spite of Boileau. Another artist of genius, Le Notre (1613-1700), created the science of artistic gardening, and was a pastmaster in beautifying the châteaux. The agriculturist La Quintinie joined the useful to the beautiful. Louis XIV. employed them both, and their names must be joined to those of the great men of this period.

Music.—The Florentine Lulli came to Paris at the age of thirty, and was with Quinault the true founder of French opera. His music now seems cold and characterless, even in the case of church music in which he excelled, but his contemporaries judged him differently. "I do not believe that any music save his will be used in Heaven," wrote Madame de Sévigné, on hearing the service for the Chancellor Séguier (May 6, 1672).

Monuments and Public Buildings.—The chief monuments of the reign of Louis XIV. were the Val-de-Grâce, the dome of which was decorated within by Mignard with a work which recalls the great mural paintings of Italy at a distance; the observatory, built according to the designs of the astronomer Picard and of Claude Pérrault (1666); the gate of St. Denis and the gate of St. Martin, designed by Blondel and his pupil, Bullet; Les Invalides, by Liberal Bruant (1674), with its church, somewhat small for the majestic dome with which Jules Mansart so boldly crowned it; the Place du Carrousel, between the Louvre and the Tuileries, so named from the magnificent banquet given there in 1662; the Place des Victoires and the Place Vendôme, created or enlarged to receive the statues which Marshal de la Feuillade and the councillors of Paris caused to be erected to Louis XIV. at the time of the Treaty of Nimwegen. Work on the Tuileries

had been carried on from the beginning of the reign. Levau (1664) built the *dome de l'Horloge*, which completed the western front, and in the following year the garden was restored to the château, from which the road had separated it. It was laid out on a new plan by Le Notre, being extended to the Champs Elysées, which were planted with trees in 1670, at the same time as the northern boulevards replaced the old ditches of the city. The *College Mazarin*, now the *Institut*, was also built by Levau, who was the architect of Fouquet's castle at Vaux, and that of the intendant Bordier at Raincy.

There was more work to be done on the Louvre. Under Louis XIII., Lemercier had completed the western interior façade by the construction of the dome de l'Horloge which was adorned by eight colossal caryatides. The masterpiece of Pierre Lescot was still to be finished. Colbert submitted the matter to competition ; the plans of the physician Claude Pérrault were preferred to those of Bernini. From 1666 to 1674 the celebrated *colonnade du Louvre* was constructed, and at the same time the exterior façade on the side of the Seine, and that on the north on the side of the modern Rue de Rivoli, were begun. At first this great work was actively pressed forward ; by degrees, progress became more slow, finally it was suspended. In spite of the remonstrances of Colbert, Louis then built Versailles.

Under Louis XIII., Versailles had been merely a village and a hunting-box. Louis XIV. determined to make it a great city and a palace. The work, which was begun in 1661, was entrusted to Jules Mansart, and went on without interruption to the end of the reign. Le Notre, Lebrun, and his pupils, especially Girardon, continued the adornment of this royal dwelling, which cost some 250,000,000 francs of our money, and which was no part of France but a creation of the king.

Water was scarce at Versailles. Louis at great expense created the machine of Marly, the result of the genius of the Liége mechanic, Rennequin Sualem. It seemed to be insufficient, and the king was anxious to divert the Eure to Versailles over valleys and hills. This was a gigantic enterprise, reminiscent of the costly and useless buildings of the Pharaohs. Dangeau wrote (June 8, 1685), "M. de Louvois returned yesterday from the river Eure where he had been to view the works. Some 1600 arches for aqueducts have been made, some of them being twice as high as the towers of Notre-Dame. Besides these 1600 large arches there are to be innumerable small arches." Ten thousand soldiers were engaged for some years on these works,

but pestilence and the wars which followed compelled their suspension, nothing being left save vast and useless ruins.

Louis also built at the same time the grand Trianon which was twice reconstructed (1671–1683) and Marly (1679), which, according to St. Simon, cost as much as Versailles, some milliards in addition to that which was expended on the famous machine. And Marly was no more than a "cottage"! The castles of St. Germain, Fontainebleau, Chambord, St. Cloud, and Sceaux were enlarged, restored, and embellished by the magnificent gardens of Le Notre. Some 160 million francs were expended on these extravagant works.

There were constructions of public utility, ports, arsenals, forts, and the canal du Midi, but the disproportion between the expenditure due to the king's whims and that due to the national interest was still excessive. That disproportion was the inevitable result of a system of government which placed the whole public revenue without debate or control at the discretion of the king.

Beginning of a New Literature.—Voltaire ends his picture of the age of Louis XIV. with these words, "The period hardly bred great geniuses despite the time of illustrious writers; towards the close of the reign nature seemed to rest." Voltaire is too modest; nature did not rest, for Voltaire himself appeared, and with him Montesquieu, Buffon, and many others. But the new writers had a different spirit. Louis XIV. had established the absolute authority of the king, but at the same time he had encouraged literature and industry, and thus prepared the two forces destined to overthrow the absolute power of the crown. Industry gave to the third estate riches for which it demanded guarantees; literature gave that estate intellect which led it to demand rights. The critical spirit which during the minority of Louis XIV. had shown itself so strongly in religious and philosophical discussions had been silenced by the splendour of the reign and had been driven to take refuge in the humble cells of some solitaries. It revived when sincere or official enthusiasm was exhausted by the weight of public misfortunes. Fénelon addressed a celebrated letter to the king (1694), which was a bitter criticism of his government, and wrote the *Télémaque*, which was a further criticism. Bayle published his *Dictionaire historique* (1697) and St. Simon every evening wrote his famous *Mémoires*. The death of Louis XIV. saw an era of change approaching.

FOURTEENTH PERIOD—THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY: DEVELOPMENT OF ABUSES IN THE ABSOLUTE MONARCHY: PROGRESS OF PUBLIC OPINION

(1715–1789)

CHAPTER LV

MINORITY OF LOUIS XV. AND REGENCY OF THE DUKE OF ORLEANS (1715–1723)

Regency of the Duke of Orleans (1715–1723).—The weight of the authority of Louis XIV. had borne heavily upon France during the last years of the reign, and the news of his death was greeted with a sigh of relief. The court and the city exhibited an outburst of unseemly joy; the very coffin of the great king was insulted. "I saw some small tents set up on the road to St. Denis," says Voltaire, "in which people were drinking, singing, laughing. The Jesuit Le Tellier was the chief instigator of this universal delight. I heard many spectators declare that the houses of the Jesuits should be set on fire with the torches which illuminated the funeral procession." Thus the eighteenth century opened with an unbecoming protest against the absolute monarchy and against the religious policy which had prevailed during the last period of the late reign.

The new king was five years old, and the question of the regency was urgent. Louis XIV. had certainly left a will, but he was under no misapprehension as to its probable validity. "As soon as I am dead it will be neither here nor there; I know too well what happened to the will of the king, my father."

As had been the case at the death of Henry IV., and again at the death of Louis XIII., there was for a time a feudal reaction, but the decline of the nobles may be gathered from the increasing weakness of their efforts. Under Marie de Medici they had still been able to excite a civil war; under Anne of Austria they had made the *Fronde;* after Louis XIV. they only produced memoirs. The boldest and most infatuated of all these nobles,

the Duke of St. Simon, wished the first prince of the blood, Philip of Orleans, to whom the testament of the king had left no more than the shadow of power, to demand the regency from the dukes and peers as the representatives of the great vassals of the past. Philip of Orleans rejected such fragile support. He assembled the parliament to destroy the posthumous despotism of Louis XIV., and in a solemn meeting alleged that the following words had fallen from the lips of the dying king, "I recommend to you the dauphin; serve him as faithfully as you have served me and labour to preserve his kingdom for him. If he dies, you will be master and to you the crown will belong. I have made such dispositions as I believe to be wise, but all cannot be foreseen, and if there is anything which is not well let it be changed." The regency, with the right of constituting the council of regency as he desired, was given to the Duke of Orleans; even the command of the royal household was taken from the Duke of Maine, who did not resign this important privilege without a violent altercation in which neither of the two princes showed to advantage.

To reward the services of his two allies the regent called upon the great nobles to take part in the affairs of state, from which Louis XIV. had excluded them; the regent replaced the ministers by six councils, almost all the members of which were nobles, though he recognised the right of the parliament to make remonstrances. But two years had not passed before the ministers were restored and parliament once more silenced, being banished in 1720 to Pontoise in a body for having opposed the schemes of Law. Neither the nobles nor the parliament could become the heir of the absolute monarchy.

State of France.—The regent had power, but Louis XIV. had left a formidable heritage. His glory had cost much; more than 2,400,000,000 of public debt, with 800,000 livres in the treasury; an extreme scarcity of coin; commerce paralysed; the nobles overburdened with debt, their lightest loan bearing an interest of 15 or 20 per cent.; the magistrates and the bond-holders long since deprived of the revenues owed them by the state; the peasants in some provinces lacking everything, even a bed on which to lie; the poor on the frontiers emigrating; much of the country uncultivated and deserted. Thanks to the sword of Villars, the great king had been able to die facing Europe nobly and proudly; but the effort could not be repeated. Peace was needed by France that she might recover; by the regent that he might retain his position.

Alliance with England (1717).—France had then no more formidable enemy than England. Despite the advantages gained from the Treaty of Utrecht, the Whigs still felt that France had escaped too lightly and demanded a renewal of war. Here, then, was an apparent danger to the country, though in actual fact there was little danger of war, Europe being for the time exhausted, and the Hanoverian dynasty, which a few months before had ascended the English throne, being forced to secure its own position before indulging in adventures abroad. A personal danger threatened the regent from Spain. Philip V., who accused Orleans of having criminal intentions towards Louis XV., demanded the regency and proposed to claim the crown, despite his earlier renunciations, if the young king died. To ally with England against Spain was to unite with the jealous guardian of the renunciation by Philip V. of all claim to the French throne; to remove the apparent national danger by an alliance which would protect him against a personal danger; such was the foreign policy of the regent, a policy beneficial to himself though fatal to the true interests of France.

By the Triple Alliance, concluded January 4, 1717, between France, England, and Holland, the regent undertook to send beyond the Alps the Stuart pretender, to demolish the new fortifications of Mardyke, which Louis XIV. had designed to replace Dunkirk as a naval base, and to complete the destruction of the port of Dunkirk, an operation which English and Dutch commissioners were authorised to supervise. The commerce and even the navigation of the south seas were forbidden to the French. The Protestant succession in England was recognised, while the English government on its side recognised the succession to the French throne as regulated by the Treaty of Utrecht, that is, the exclusion of Philip V. Finally, a defensive alliance was concluded between the two countries.

War with Spain (1719–1720).—This treaty led to a war with Spain, the plans of Cardinal Alberoni precipitating hostilities. That bold minister of Philip V. had undertaken to revive the finances, agriculture, and marine of Spain at home, while abroad he proposed to regain the provinces taken from Spain by the Treaty of Utrecht. That he might succeed the better in this object he set Europe in flames. The emperor was already deeply involved in war with the Turks; England was to be occupied by hurling upon her Charles XII. of Sweden, who should overthrow the Hanoverians and restore the Stuarts; France was to be neutralised by a similar plot having for its aim the

restoration of Philip V. All the enemies of the regent were approached and united. The Spanish ambassador, Cellamare, was the agent in these culpable intrigues ; the Duchess of Maine, who had all the energy and ambition which her husband lacked and who kept at Sceaux an opposition court to that of the Palais Royal, was the soul of the plot. The nobles of Brittany, wounded by the loss of certain privileges, were almost all engaged in the conspiracy. But the plot was discovered ; Cellamare and the Duke and Duchess of Maine were arrested. The regent made the most of this event, in order to give the appearance of reprisals to the almost fratricidal war on which he was about to enter.

Austria joined the Triple Alliance in 1718, and France, used under Louis XIV. to fighting single-handed against all Europe, found herself at the head of a coalition against Spain. The English, who now adopted a system which they constantly practised during the century, fell upon the Spanish fleet without a declaration of war on the coast of Sicily and defeated it (August, 1718). Another fleet, which was to carry the Pretender to Scotland, was destroyed by a storm, and the English captured the port of Vigo in Galicia, while Berwick with a French army carried Fontarabia (June, 1719). A French army thus marched against Philip V., whom French arms had seated on the throne of Charles V. and whose flags bore the lilies of the Bourbons. Alberoni fell before so many reverses, and Spain accepted the conditions dictated by the Quadruple Alliance. The Duke of Savoy received Sardinia in exchange for Sicily, which went to the emperor with the Milanese. But the elder of the infantas of Spain was granted the reversion of the duchies of Parma, Piacenza, and Tuscany (January, 1720). This peace strengthened the dominion of Austria over Italy and of England over the ocean.

Dubois.—The enemies of France owed these results to a councillor to whom the regent had delivered himself body and soul, the Abbé Dubois. "Dubois," says St. Simon, "was a little thin man, mean and ferret-like. All the vices—perfidy, avarice, debauchery, the basest flattery—fought for mastery over his soul. He lied so that he would boldly deny a thing when taken red-handed. He learned to talk with an assumed stammer to give himself time to read the minds of others. Falseness sweated from every pore of his body." He had also a supple and active intelligence, extreme malice, and great capacity for work. Such was the former tutor of the Duke of Orleans, who had, with the

help of the court of St. Cloud, communicated to his pupil every vice that the duke's generous nature could assimilate. Dubois had ably negotiated the treaty of the Triple Alliance. The regent recompensed him by giving him the ministry of foreign affairs, on the advice of the British cabinet, and Dubois wrote to Stanhope, "I owe you the position that I hold and I earnestly desire to use it always according to your wishes, for the service of his Britannic Majesty, whose interests will always be sacred to me." On this occasion Dubois was speaking the truth, for England paid well to be served well; 50,000 crowns a year, or even a million, according to St. Simon.

Dubois did better later on. "Sir," he said to the regent one day, "I dreamed that you made me Archbishop of Cambrai." "You, an archbishop," cried the regent, and told him some hard truths. Yet, as was his habit, he gave way, laughing always at the impudence of this man whom he despised and whose brains he used. Shameful to relate, Massillon and another bishop vouched for the high moral character of the postulant, who received all his orders in one day and profaned by his occupancy the see which had so recently been dignified by the virtues of Fénelon. A little later Dubois also became a cardinal at a cost of 8,000,000 and in 1723 the assembly of the clergy of France elected him as its president.

Peter the Great at Paris (1717).—In the midst of such pettiness and corruption there appeared at the court of France a gigantic figure, who seemed the greater from his semi-barbarism, Peter the Great, the creator of Russia. He was received magnificently and with the most delicate attentions, but he was not misled by the brilliant exterior of the French capital. Seeing the statue of Richelieu at the Sorbonne, he seized the marble with both hands, crying, "Great man, I would give half my kingdom to learn from you how to govern what remained." All that Peter found to admire in France was the past; the present seemed to him so poor that he foretold the decay and approaching ruin of the French people. He saw only the surface and he judged the nation by the court; but according to his knowledge he was a true prophet, for the nobles and the monarchy were dying.

Disorder of the Finances.—A debt of 2,400,000,000, a third of which was immediately repayable; a revenue, the gross value of which was 165,000,000, but which, collected by 100,000 collectors or agents, had a net value of only 69,000,000; 147,000,000 annual expenditure; and thus an annual deficit of 78,000,000; the bulk of the receipts for the next year already

spent—such was the condition of the finances at the death of Louis XIV. As a remedy some advisers recommended bankruptcy, alleging that the government was not responsible for the debts of the previous reign, and among these was St. Simon. But he proposed to accomplish the bankruptcy by means of the States-General, finding no other use for them than this.

The Duke de Noailles, president of the council of finances, at first secured some resources by recoining specie ; then he tried, on the one hand, to reduce the debt by reducing the rate of interest, by a careful inquiry into frauds, and by an examination of accounts ; and on the other hand, to bring expenditure more into harmony with income. The brothers Paris, distinguished and upright financiers, were entrusted with the work of investigation which much reduced the number of state bills in circulation. They had to be supported by a chamber of justice in order to overcome the resistance of the bondholders ; a system of terror and denunciation was organised against the creditors of the state ; many persons were ruined, condemned to the pillory, and even executed ; others committed suicide, but the majority found a way of escape by buying the protection of the regent's friends, of influential women, and even of members of the chamber of justice. It had been hoped that 220,000,000 would be derived from this inquiry which affected 4410 individuals ; 70,000,000 was secured, hardly fifteen of which reached the treasury as cash. Despite these executions and some useful measures, the deficit in 1716 was still 97,000,000. The remedy had not yet been found, when a man appeared who claimed to know the secret of success.

Financial Revolution of Law (1716–1720).—A Scotsman, John Law or Lass, son of a goldsmith, was initiated at an early age into the work of banking, and later became accustomed to the combinations of gaming by which he made his fortune. He was endowed with great mental capacity and with a great power of speech ; he dreamed of creating a new factor, credit, basing his plans on a principle which was only a half-truth: that the prosperity of commerce and industry depends on abundance of money, with the natural consequence that a metallic coinage which is not susceptible of indefinite increase is not advantageous, but that paper money, which *is* so susceptible, is the best form of currency.

Noailles opposed the idea of making the first experiment with the finances of the state, and Law was forced to confine himself to the foundation of a private bank (May, 1716) with a capital

of 6,000,000 represented by 12,000 shares of 5000 livres each, payable one quarter in coin and three-quarters in notes. The bank discounted at 6 per cent. per annum and soon even at 4 per cent. bills of exchange which had not hitherto been capable of being discounted except at a ruinous rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per month. The bank also issued notes payable at sight in coin. Every one hastened to secure its paper, which greatly facilitated commerce. Activity revived in all businesses and the state established the reputation of the bank for solvency by ordering the officials of the treasury to receive its notes as coin in payment of dues and taxes (April, 1717). On December 4, 1718, the bank was erected into a royal bank.

But already Law had added to the bank a company which secured the monopoly of trade in the Mississippi valley. His initial success made men anticipate a like success for his new venture; wonderful results were to follow from the exploitation of Louisiana. The *Compagnie d'Occident* issued shares in a great undertaking for the cultivation and colonisation of the banks of the Mississippi, and the customary stories of gold and silver mines discovered in these districts attracted the public by the hope of rich profits. The company soon absorbed the other companies of Senegal and the East Indies, assumed the title of *Compagnie des Indes*, and opened every quarter of the globe as a field for speculators. So rash were the hopes formed of this enterprise that shares of 500 livres were bought at ten, twenty, thirty, and forty times their face value.

Law had promised the regent that his system would extinguish the national debt; to keep his word he laid down that the shares in his company, which were so greatly appreciated in value, could be bought only by paying one-fourth in coin and three-fourths in treasury notes. As a result the treasury notes, which had been at a discount of 20 or 30 per cent., recovered, since they were required in order to buy shares, and the state paid its debts with paper which it could increase at will without alarming the public. Once this conflict between paper and coin had begun, the government maintained the paper by every means and struck blows at the value of the coinage in order to discredit it; such was the aim of the constant changes to which the coinage was subjected, its value being alternately raised and reduced.

This was the most brilliant period of the system. The shares rose, in October, 1719, to 20,000 francs. The Rue Quincampoix, which had become the seat of the state bank, was crowded to suffocation; Paris, all France, even foreigners, hastened to it,

attracted by the hope of gain. All classes gave themselves up to frenzied stock-jobbing, and enormous profits were made in a moment. A servant in the morning became the master by the evening. A tanner of Montelimart retired with 70,000,000 ; a banker's servant with 50,000,000 ; a Savoyard with 40,000,000, while a little hunchback made 150,000 livres by allowing his back to be used as a desk. The Duke of Bourbon and his mother made 60,000,000. This grandson of Condé showed one day to a favourite courtier the magic wealth in his portfolio. "Sir," said the courtier, "two of your grandfather's deeds were worth all this wealth." It would have been enough to have said one deed. The regent also made profit, and as much as he wished, but it went to the courtiers, as he knew not how to keep it. Public morality fell to a low point under the stress of such sudden changes of fortune and of these illegitimate gains. A Count of Horn murdered a courtier in order to steal his shares.

But the bank attained its end ; it lent the state 1,600,000,000 livres of paper money with which the national creditors were paid and which came back to the bank in exchange for shares in the company. But the loss clearly had to fall on some one, and it came upon those who did not know, like the wiser financiers of Geneva and Holland, when to go out of the system. In vain Law tried to moderate the issue of paper ; he could no longer do so. To maintain the extraordinary business operations and to satisfy so many insatiable appetites, he was obliged to create continually more and more paper, the amount of which soon passed three milliards, while the currency was below 700,000,000. This disproportion prepared a disaster. The system rested only on the confidence of the public and this confidence could not sustain it long. To save the company, the adventurous part of his system, Law reunited it with the bank, the serious and useful part of the system. This was the destruction of both. As early as the end of 1719 some became less enthusiastic ; the more prudent began to realise and presented their notes to the bank. The example was followed and alarm spread ; those who realised increased in numbers ; they sold their shares as high as possible and bought with the notes gold, silver, and diamonds, or lands ; or, like the Duke de la Force, an infamous monopolist who was afterwards put on his trial, tallow, grease, soap, spices, for fabulous sums. The shares ceased to rise ; their value fluctuated ; then they began to fall rapidly. Every one saw the approaching catastrophe and demanded specie. Law, who was now comptroller-general, struggled despairingly against those who were realising ; cash

payments were suspended, except for small transactions which were specified. It was forbidden to hoard gold and silver and prosecutions, domiciliary visits, denunciations followed, a son even denouncing his father. To support the paper currency against the metallic coinage, notes for ten livres were issued; offices were opened for the sole purpose of dealing with these notes, which were mainly in the hands of the poor. There was such a crowd that three persons were stifled, and the angry mob bore the corpses to lay them below the regent's windows. Law barely escaped being torn in pieces. Then by a sudden change of policy, the state which had almost proscribed the metallic coinage, announced that it would no longer receive payments in paper, and thus sentenced the system to death. Law escaped from France, pursued by the curses of the people. When he arrived in Paris he had 1,600,000 francs; he took away with him only a few louis (December, 1720). It remained to effect the liquidation of the company. The brothers Paris-Duverney conducted that operation, the state recognising its liability for 1,700,000,000 for the benefit of the company's creditors. But the extinction of a great number of offices and the recovery of many forms of revenue which had been alienated compensated for this burden. The state was at least in no worse a financial position than it had been when Law arrived.

Changes in Manners and Ideas.—Such was the story of the famous system of Law. It illustrated the power of credit; it gave to industry and oversea commerce an energetic impulse; it freed agriculture from the tithe on landed property and from the arrears on the *taille;* it released the country from a number of useless sinecures, and though it ruined individuals, it improved the public fortune by a reduction of 20,000,000 in taxation and by a redistribution of public burdens more favourable to the lower class. But by revolutionising the positions of individuals and by effecting great changes of fortune, it also accelerated the dawning change in manners and ideas. The solemn and grave court of Louis XIV. vanished. It could not revive under a king who was a minor and who had not the granting of favours, under a regent who was ready enough to snatch some moments from his pleasures in order to attend to affairs, but would not spare a minute for the service of etiquette and the task of representing the monarchy. Following his example, every one threw off all restraint and all taste, both in the great and in the petty affairs of life. The severe and majestic were replaced by the piquant and amusing. The coldly sublime pencil of Lebrun no longer

depicted vast heroic scenes on the great walls of the palace, but Boucher made gay the interiors of elegant boudoirs with laughing and insipid shepherdesses, bathed in rose-coloured light under blue skies.

If art declined, manners followed suit, and cynicism both of conduct and of thought was openly adopted. The regent himself set the example. He forbade nothing; he permitted all things and himself overthrew the idols of an earlier day. "How does it concern the state, if I or my servants get drunk?" he remarked cynically. Never had there been such frivolity of conduct, such licentiousness of mind, as in the foolish gatherings of the profligates of the Duke of Orleans. There had been only one *salon* in France, the king's; a thousand appeared in a society which was occupied neither with religious matters, for Fénelon and Bossuet were dead; nor with war, for all spoke of perpetual peace; nor with the grave futilities of etiquette, since Versailles was a desert. The world demanded change and pleasure; a free rein was given to the intellectual, to the men of letters, even to the most daring.

The *Œdipus* of Voltaire and the *Lettres persanes* of Montesquieu struck the first blow at the old regime (1718 and 1721), and that hardly thirty-six years after La Bruyère complained that, being born a Christian and a Frenchman, he could deal with no great topics.

Plague of Marseilles (1720).—While the court indulged in a saturnalia, a terrible scourge desolated Provence, where the plague carried off 85,000 persons. The admirable devotion of Bishop Belzunce, the Chancellor Roze, and many sheriffs at Marseilles, all of whom risked their lives a thousand times to save those of their fellow-citizens, consoled France for this calamity. And as devotion also is contagious the farmers gave 3,000,000 to succour this unhappy district during the famine which followed the pestilence. The father of Vauvenargues was then first consul of Aix; he remained at his post, bore himself well, and his lordship was raised to a marquisate.

Death of Dubois and of the Duke of Orleans (1723).—On February 13, 1723, Louis XV. was declared to be of age, having completed his thirteenth year. This declaration ended the regency of Orleans, but the king was bound long to remain in need of guidance. The duke, to preserve his power after the regency, had already given Dubois the position of first minister, which on the death of the cardinal he assumed himself. But he held it less than four months, dying on December 2, 1723, from

an attack of apoplexy which he and every one else saw coming, which he could have prevented, but which he did not care to avoid by changing the murderous habits of a life of debauchery. France had been eight years in his hands; that time sufficed for the moral revolution which had been preparing during the last years of Louis XIV. to burst forth. To control the political and social effects which followed, a great reign was needed, but the prince who now began to rule set instead an example of every scandal, developed every abuse, and humiliated France before all foreign countries.

CHAPTER LVI

REIGN OF LOUIS XV. (1723–1774)

Ministry of the Duke of Bourbon (1723–1726).—The morals of the Duke of Bourbon, who became first minister on the death of the ex-regent, were little better than those of his predecessor. He showed extreme rigour against the Protestants and Jansenists. He renewed and even increased the severities of Louis XIV. Not only were Protestants obliged to be converted, but those who simulated conversion were condemned to death as relapsed; a dying man, who declared himself a Protestant and subsequently recovered his health, was banished and his property confiscated. Emigration was renewed, as had been the case after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes; the senate of Stockholm offered Sweden as an asylum for the fugitives and the French government was compelled by the popular outcry to reduce its rigours.

The English ministry had continued to Madame de Prie, who was all-powerful with the Duke of Bourbon, the pension which had been granted to Dubois, and the duke maintained the Anglo-French alliance. He sealed that alliance by a new and insulting rupture with Spain. The regent, towards the end of his life, had attempted a reconciliation with the court of Madrid and had demanded the hand of an infanta for Louis XV. The young princess, aged four years, was brought to Paris that she might be educated in the court over which she was one day to rule. Bourbon, when he became minister, disliked the idea of a marriage of which he was not the author, and which further, since it could not be consummated for some time, left the kingdom meanwhile without an heir. An accident might raise to the

throne the new Duke of Orleans, the first prince of the blood, and that could not advance the credit of the Duke of Bourbon. The duke was further alarmed by an illness which seized the young king. As soon as Louis was restored to health, without considering the resultant anger of Spain, or the proposals of the czarina, Catherine I., who offered her daughter and the powerful alliance of Russia, the minister determined to provide the king with a wife who should owe everything to the Duke of Bourbon and have no external support. Madame de Prie at first wished the new queen to be a sister of the duke, but as that princess treated her with hauteur, she feared the effects of her power. At that time a Polish noble, Stanislas Leczinski, who had been deprived of the crown which Charles XII. of Sweden had once secured for him, was living at Weissembourg on a pension received from France. One day the ex-king entered his room in great agitation and cried to his wife and daughter, "Let us fall on our knees and give thanks to God." "Have you been recalled to the throne of Poland?" asked his daughter. "Much bêtter; you are to be Queen of France." It was upon the pious and gentle Marie Leczinski that the first minister had decided, despite the fact that she was seven years older than the king, very poor, and without either beauty or youth. On her marriage day she distributed her wedding presents among the ladies of the palace, saying, "There, this is the first time in my life that I have been able to give presents." The infanta of Spain was sent back to her father, this being the second occasion in ten years that the foreign policy of Louis XIV. had been repudiated.

Angry at this insult, Philip V. was led to conclude with Austria the Treaty of Vienna (1725). Charles VI. had founded at Ostend, for trade with the Indies, a company in opposition to the English and Dutch companies. The King of Spain granted the Austrian merchants extensive privileges in all the ports of his dominions. The emperor had promulgated a pragmatic sanction under which the succession was assured to his daughters, contrary to the custom of the Austrian territories, and Philip V. guaranteed this act. In return the emperor engaged to aid Spain to recover Gibraltar and Port Mahon, renewed the promises already made as to the duchies of Parma and Tuscany, and even affianced the two archduchesses to two infants of Spain, thus foreshadowing the reunion of Spain and Austria which Louis XIV. had prevented by such great efforts. Such was the outcome of the policy of Bourbon. He at least began the formation of a counter-alliance between France, England,

and Prussia, but it was left to another minister to complete this work.

Fleury took the place of the Duke of Bourbon. Prudent and ambitious, the new minister pursued the path to power without causing discussion and without haste. He had been Bishop of Frejus when Louis XIV. appointed him tutor to his grandson. An amiable and spiritual old man, he gained the full confidence of his pupil, who wished to make him first minister on the death of the regent, but Fleury declined the post, feeling that "from M. le Duc d'Orleans to a private person would be too great a come down." As a political nonentity, the Duke of Bourbon appeared to be suitable to soften the transition; Fleury meanwhile neglecting no means of making himself dear and necessary to the king. Bourbon was jealous and tried to accustom the king to do without the prelate. One day Fleury waited a long time in the royal cabinet, and Louis did not appear; the bishop at once left the court, retired to Issy into the house of the congregation of St. Sulpice, and the king, on his return from hunting, received a letter full of laments, in which the retirement of his former tutor was announced as well as his resolution to pass the rest of his days in obscurity. Louis was in despair. "Well, sire," said the Duke of Mortemart, "are you not master? Inform the duke that he must send at once to fetch M. de Frejus, and you will see that he will return." Fleury came back more powerful than he had ever been, while the duke on the other hand was discredited. The restoration of the *droit de joyeux avénement* and of the *ceinture de la reine*, ancient exactions which had become obsolete, was unpopular. A project, impracticable at that time, for the prevention of begging, and the prohibition of building in the suburbs of Paris, for fear of plague which was only too likely to come from the narrow and dirty streets of the centre of the city, caused dissatisfaction. Complaints were also made against the establishment of a militia raised by lot from the male population of each parish, and still more against the imposition of a fiftieth levied in kind on all the fruits of the earth and in coin on other forms of revenue. Against this, not only the people at large, but also the upper classes, were roused, for both classes were equally threatened; so loud an outcry was raised that the minister fell. One day, as the king left for Rambouillet, he said graciously to the duke, "My cousin, do not make me wait for supper." At seven on the same evening, a lieutenant of the guards escorted Bourbon to Chantilly. The disgrace of the minister killed Madame de Prie and reflected

on the queen, to whom the king wrote sternly, "I ask you, madame, and if need be I order you, to do all that the Bishop of Frejus tells you on my behalf, as if the command came directly from me.—Louis." (June 11, 1726.) The intervention of the police alone prevented the people of Paris from lighting bonfires.

Ministry of Fleury (1726–1743): Internal Affairs: The Convulsionists.—Such was the history of the rise to power of the septuagenarian Bishop of Frejus, who soon afterwards became a cardinal. He refused, as too high-sounding, the title of first minister, taking only that of minister of state, and he urged the king to declare that "he would govern personally and in all things follow as far as possible the example of his great-grandfather," an excellent but lying declaration. Though he was of an age to rule, Louis XV. contented himself with exhibiting to the council his handsome person and impassive face, which nothing could make animated. Besides this, when he was neither gambling nor hunting, he worked at tapestry, carved in wood, and read either the secret correspondence which he carried on with his ambassadors without the knowledge of his ministers or the scandalous stories which were supplied to him regularly every day by the lieutenant of police. Such were his pastimes; at a latter date, they became different and worse. Fleury bore the weight of government alone, but did so modestly and without display. Having become the first personage in the state, he appeared to be still merely the Abbé Fleury. "His position," says Voltaire, "did not change his manners at all. Men were astonished to find the first minister the most amiable and most disinterested person in the court. He allowed France to make good her losses in peace and to become rich from her extensive trade, making no innovations, treating the state as a strong and robust body which would recover naturally without aid." D'Argenson often heard Fleury speak with contempt of Richelieu and with admiration of Mazarin. Like the latter, the minister loved to evade difficulties rather than to overcome them, and if he had not the dexterity and breadth of view of Mazarin, it must be added that he was also without Mazarin's greed. At his death his property amounted hardly to that of an average bourgeois.

The country was weary of hare-brained financiers and politicians, and this senile ministry, this government which governed as little as possible and which made *laissez-faire* a system, was popular and lasted for seventeen years. Fleury made his object

peace and economy, two excellent aims, provided that the first is not inconsistent with the maintenance of prestige and that the second does not degenerate into miserliness. He was blessed for the abolition of the *fiftieth*, for the reduction of the *taille*, for remitting arrears of taxation, and for certain other measures which were suggested by the able financier Orry. He revived public credit, restored for a time the balance between income and expenditure, built roads, unhappily with the aid of the *corvée*,[1] and restored Sainte Menhould which had been destroyed by fire seven years before. But, with all his desire for economy, he could not check the greed of the contractors of the revenue; he left industry and commerce to themselves, which would have been excellent if they had been free, and he allowed the navy to go to rack and ruin, reducing the budget to 9,000,000 for personnel and to 500,000 livres for material. And when he was forced to make war, and his ministry both began and ended in war, he made it half-heartedly, and consequently unsuccessfully.

Like his predecessor, Fleury forgot that tolerance which had been practised by Richelieu and Mazarin. He put in force the bull *Unigenitus;* he imprisoned many ecclesiastics, and even a bishop who refused to sign the bull, dismissed the Jansenist professors from the Sorbonne, Rollin among them, and annulled a protest from the parliament. When the magistrates persisted in their protest, he exiled forty of them; fearing disturbance, he presently recalled them (1730), with the result that the parliament, emboldened, allowed a spirit of opposition to enter once more into the sanctuary of the laws. Such mingled violence and feebleness led the Jansenists to adopt a new plan. One of their number, the deacon Paris, of the parish of St. Medard in Paris, an austere and ascetic man, died in 1727, in the odour of sanctity according to his partisans. It was presently announced that he was working miracles and one of those moral epidemics which occur and spread at certain times and which are more infectious than ordinary epidemics at once followed. Strange things occurred at the cemetery of St. Medard; those who laid themselves on the tomb of the deacon experienced, by the aid of their imagination, convulsions, nervous twitchings, sometimes harmful, sometimes beneficial. The government was wise enough not to interfere; ridicule made an end of the folly which lasted five years. When the police finally closed the cemetery in 1732, a jester wrote on the wall :—

[1] Statute labour.

"De par le roi défense à Dieu
De faire miracle en ce lieu."

Foreign Affairs: Reconciliation with Spain (1726–1731).—The Duke of Bourbon had left his successor a quarrel with Spain then allied to Austria, a circumstance which compelled the maintenance of the English alliance. Robert Walpole, the chief minister of George II., needed peace to maintain himself in power, desiring from motives of policy that which Fleury desired from his nature. The two easily agreed, and relying on each other made mutual sacrifices. Fleury neglected the navy in order to avoid giving offence to the English people, and Walpole, assured of the moderation of France, was undisturbed by the size of the French army and certain victories won by that force. The war between the two alliances produced no events except a vain attempt by the Spaniards on Gibraltar in 1727. Fleury put an end to the conflict in the same year by the preliminaries of Paris, and in the following year, at the Congress of Soissons, Spain and Austria broke away from each other. To make this rupture definite France and England hastened to guarantee the Italian duchies to Spain by the Treaty of Seville (1729), and two years later, on the death of the last Duke of Parma and Piacenza, Don Carlos was placed in possession of those territories. The emperor complained in vain, and withdrew his opposition when the powers accepted the Pragmatic Sanction. At the conclusion of these intricate negotiations, a good understanding was restored between the courts of Madrid and Versailles, and a Bourbon had acquired a duchy in Italy, which he was soon to exchange for a kingdom.

War of the Polish Succession (1733–1735).—The death of Augustus II., King of Poland, produced a breach of the new peace. His succession was claimed by Stanislas Leczinski, the national canditate, and by Augustus of Saxony, who was supported by the Russians and Austrians. Fleury would have willingly remained neutral, but was forced by public opinion to aid the queen's father. But he exhibited such a degree of slowness in reaching a decision that Augustus III. was crowned at Cracow and forced Stanislas to take refuge in Dantzic, where he was besieged by the Russians. Fleury sent 1500 men to help the protégé of France. Their commander, realising the valueless character of such a force, retired to Copenhagen. There he found Count Pelo, who blushed as an ambassador of France for his country, and wished to cover at least some of the shame by a sacrifice; he sent the men back to Dantzic. "I know that I shall never return; I recommend

my wife and children to you," wrote the commander to the minister Maurepas. He forced three of the Russian lines, to fall, mortally wounded, at the fourth; his soldiers, surrounded, were slain or surrendered. Stanislas was compelled to fly in the disguise of a sailor, and Poland fell into a state of dependence on Russia and Austria. France had lost a chance of saving that country from the abyss into which she was drifting.

Something had to be done to repair this disgrace. Fleury concluded the Treaty of Turin with Spain and Savoy against Austria, by which the kingdom of Naples was promised to Don Carlos and some parts of Milan to the King of Sardinia. By promising to abstain from all attacks on the Austrian Netherlands, Fleury secured the neutrality of England and Holland. He then set on foot two armies, one on the Rhine and the other in Italy, commanded by the old marshals, Berwick and Villars, the latter of whom was still as vigorous as a young man. Berwick took Kehl, opposite Strasburg, despite Eugène, laid siege to Philippsburg, and was shot in the head. "I always said truly," cried Villars, "that Berwick was born happier than I was." Villars did not have that soldier's death for which he longed. After two brilliant campaigns, which had been conducted with great rapidity, because, as he gaily said, he was too old to be slow, the marshal died at Turin in his eighty-second year (1734). Marshal Coigny, who succeeded him, won the victories of Parma (June) and Guastella (September), which gave the French the Milanese, while Count Montemar gained the Battle of Bitonto which placed the Infant on the throne of Naples and Sicily (May). France had revived gloriously, but the timidity of the cardinal prevented her from winning the fruits of her success. It would have been possible, as the Chancellor Chauvelin, the ablest member of the council, wished, to have forced the emperor to renounce all his Italian possessions. He was merely obliged to renounce the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, and even so, was compensated by the acquisition of Parma and Piacenza for himself and of Tuscany for his son-in-law in exchange for Lorraine. A supplementary clause, due to Chauvelin, assigned Lorraine and Bar to Stanislas, as compensation for the throne of Poland, with reversion to France after his death. The acquisition was valuable, but had long been inevitable. Such were the terms of the Treaty of Vienna (1735–1738). This was the best period of Fleury's ministry; France, in this war, had once more won glory and had appeared as a mediator for Europe.

War of the Austrian Succession (1741–1748).—In 1740 the

Emperor Charles VI. died. In his anxiety to secure his inheritance for his daughter, Maria Theresa, he had shrunk from no sacrifice. He had suppressed the Ostend company in order to conciliate the maritime powers ; he had ceded Lorraine in order to gain France and Naples, and Sicily in order to gain Spain. He had obtained from every state a solemn recognition of the Pragmatic Sanction, and he left his daughter an ample collection of parchments. "It would have been of more value to have left her an army of 200,000 men," said Frederic II. Hardly was Charles VI. dead than five claimants presented themselves. The Elector of Bavaria, descendant of a daughter of Ferdinand I. ; the King of Spain, descended in the female line from Charles V. ; and the Elector of Saxony, son-in-law of the Emperor Joseph I., demanded the whole inheritance by right of blood. The King of Sardinia desired the duchy of Milan ; Frederic II., King of Prussia, desired the four duchies of Silesia. Frederic had a small kingdom, but his father had left him a large treasure and a fine army, and he was endowed by nature with rare talents. He began by seizing what he claimed, instead of negotiating, and the Battle of Mollwitz gave him three-fourths of Silesia (April 20, 1741).

Alliance of France with Frederic II.—At the opening of this campaign Frederic had said to the French ambassador, "I am going to play your game ; if I win, we will share." A grandson of Fouquet, Count Belle-Isle, a man of schemes, bold and adventurous, proposed in the council an alliance with Prussia. He also brought forward a plan which was to limit the possessions of Maria Theresa to Hungary, Lower Austria, and Belgium, the rest being divided among the various claimants, the Elector of Bavaria becoming emperor, and France taking nothing for herself. The scheme was over-generous, but lofty sentiments in foreign affairs were popular at the court of Louis XV. Magnanimity would make it possible to limit action, and despite Fleury, the Treaty of Nymphenburg was concluded on this basis (May 18, 1741).

Campaign of Bohemia: Defection of Frederic II.: Death of Fleury (1741–1743).—France, instead of acting resolutely with all her forces, as she should have done when once she had drawn the sword, only set on foot an army of 40,000 men, and in place of acting on the side of the Low Countries, where her destiny called her, she renewed in Germany the errors which had once been committed in Italy, sending her army into the heart of Bavaria. It is just to add that the maritime powers had consented to remain neutral on the same terms as in the War of

the Polish Succession, that the French should not attack the Austrian Netherlands. Master of Linz, the chief barrier of Austria on the upper Danube, the elector might have taken Vienna; he preferred to conquer Bohemia. Maria Theresa had time to raise her faithful Hungarians. While the elector caused himself to be crowned emperor at Frankfort, the Austrians entered Munich (January, 1742). Frederic, it is true, threatened Moravia and defeated the Austrians at Czaslau in Bohemia (May 17), but Maria Theresa was capable of making a needed sacrifice. She abandoned Silesia to Prussia, and on this condition Frederic broke his oath to France (July).

This defection produced others. The Elector of Saxony retired from the war; the King of Sardinia entered it, but on the side of Austria; and England began to abandon the pacific policy of Walpole (February, 1742), declaring war on Spain because that country closed her colonies to English trade and demanding war against France because her commerce had been rapidly growing. Carteret, who succeeded Walpole, promised Maria Theresa a subsidy of 12,000,000. All the burden of the conflict thus fell on France, after she had taken up arms for the benefit of others. The army of Bohemia was cut off from Bavaria by the recovery of Linz, from Budweiss by the Austrians, and besieged in Prague where it had at least offered a stout defence. Fleury, who had thought the war finished and had begun to disarm, was disturbed at these reverses and wrote to Count Koenigsegg, the Austrian general, a most humble and confidential letter. Koenigsegg published it. The old man complained of this in a second letter and declared that he had only written just what he thought. This letter was likewise made public. Fleury, twice made the laughing-stock of Europe, redoubled the amusement by disavowing his own letters. He had ruined everything by his timidity. Maillebois, who was operating in Franconia, could do nothing for the relief of Prague except capture Egra, which at least left Belle-Isle a line of retreat down the Main. Belle-Isle evacuated Prague with 14,000 men, and through ice, snow, and the enemy made a glorious though painful retreat; the noble and unfortunate Vauvenargue lost his health in this operation. Chevert remained in Prague with the sick and wounded; he was summoned to surrender at discretion. "Tell your general that if he does not grant me the honours of war, I will set fire to the four quarters of Prague and bury myself in its ruins." The conditions which Chevert demanded were granted (January, 1743). Some days later, Fleury died at the

age of eighty-nine; he had desired to maintain peace at all costs and he left France involved in a great war.

Battle of Dettingen (1743): Defection of Bavaria (1745).—England now entered the lists. An Anglo-German army of 50,000 arrived in the valley of the Main; Marshal Noailles hemmed them in at Dettingen, but the rash impetuosity of the Duke of Gramont ruined his able combinations, and in place of a victory there was merely a bloody fight. De Broglie who commanded on the Danube fell back as far as the Rhine before the Austrians, and Noailles was obliged to follow this retirement (1743). To restore the fortunes of war, it was felt necessary that the king should appear at the head of the army. A new favourite, the Duchess of Chateauroux, an energetic and ambitious woman, wished to draw the king from his unworthy sloth. Louis XV. was thus induced in 1744 to show himself to his troops. The general plan of the war had been modified; instead of fighting in the heart of Germany, it was decided to strike nearer home. The king invaded the Low Countries and saw Marshal Saxe take some towns. Hearing that the Austrians were threatening Alsace, he hastened to that district with Noailles and 50,000 men.

A serious illness overtook him at Metz. The approach of death filled him with edifying thoughts, which did not endure, but enabled him to utter one fine remark. He sent away the Duchess of Chateauroux in order that he might be reconciled with the queen, and he remarked to Noailles, "Remember that while Louis XIII. was being borne to his grave, the Prince of Condé gained a battle." France gave willing recognition to this effort on the part of her king. The whole realm was filled with grief; "if he dies, it will be because he marched to our help: he will die at the moment when he has become a great king." One night a rumour came to Paris that he was no more; the afflicted crowd spread through the streets, into the churches, with tears and groans. When it became known that he was alive, there was each day a crowd of people round the couriers, and those who brought good news were carried in triumph. When at last his health was restored, the churches resounded with thanks to God for having preserved the *Bien Aimé* (1744). It was an easy task that a king had to perform when monarchy was so popular. Meanwhile the King of Prussia, alarmed at the progress of Austria, once more took up arms and penetrated into Bohemia. This diversion freed the line of the Rhine. The Emperor Charles VII. returned to his electorate, but only to die.

His son treated with Maria Theresa ; she restored him all that she held in Bavaria, and Maximilian renounced all claims to the Austrian succession (Treaty of Fussen, 1745).

Marshal Saxe: Battle of Fontenoy (1745).—The war had now no purpose from the point of view of France, but as her enemies refused to treat, she was obliged to fight for peace. France sought that peace by way of the Low Countries. Marshal Saxe, dying though he was, put himself at the head of the army and invested Tournai. To prevent the fall of that town 55,000 English and Dutch came up, under the Duke of Cumberland. Saxe decided to fight a defensive battle, and took up a strong position seven kilometres to the south-east of Tournai, his right resting on Anthouin, his centre on Fontenoy, and his left on the wood of Barry. The two villages and the wood were protected by a hundred cannon. The battle began at six in the morning. The English three times assaulted Fontenoy and the Dutch twice appeared before Anthouin, being so vigorously repulsed on the second occasion that they did not renew the engagement.

The attack having failed at these two points, the Duke of Cumberland massed his infantry in a single column in order to pierce the centre of the French line. The English advanced, preceded by six pieces of artillery and with six other pieces in their centre. At a distance of fifty paces from the French line their officers saluted by raising their hats. The officers of the guard returned the salute. Then Lord Hay cried, " Gentlemen of the French guard, fire." Count Auteroche answered in a loud voice, " Gentlemen, we never fire first ; fire yourselves." The English fired a volley, which brought to the ground 23 officers and 380 soldiers. The first rank was thus broken and disorder spread to the others. The English advanced slowly as if on parade. The majors were seen laying their canes on the muskets of the soldiers to make them keep them lowered and in line. Fontenoy and the redoubt in the wood were outflanked. Ten regiments in succession hurled themselves against this long column, massive and unbreakable owing to its bravery and strength. They were repulsed, since the attacks were not concerted ; the battle was compromised. Saxe, who was borne in a little osier carriage, because he could not mount a horse, dared not risk more, as he had to guard the king and the dauphin, and everything was prepared for a retreat. But the English column, astonished at finding itself in the midst of the French with no cavalry, and with no support from the Dutch, halted, in doubt but full of pride ; it appeared to be master of the

battlefield. Richelieu advised firing at the mass with cannon; some pieces of artillery were placed together for this purpose and the marshal ordered a general assault at the same time on the flanks of the column. The English broke under this attack, and the murderous artillery and musketry fire. They opened their ranks; the column was broken and its strength gone. Its remains fled hastily towards the reserves. The allies lost from 12,000 to 14,000 men; the French over 7000. It was a great victory, though it had not been wisely gained. Considerable results followed; Tournai, Ghent, the general depôt of the allies, Oudenarde, Bruges, Dendermonde, and Ostend capitulated. At the beginning of the following year the French entered Brussels.

Second Defection of Prussia: Reverses in Italy (1745–1756).—The King of Prussia, victor at the same time at Friedburg in Silesia, wrote to Louis XV., "I am about to pay the bill which your Majesty drew on me at Fontenoy." The victory of Kesseldorf opened Saxony and Dresden to him; he signed a new treaty with Maria Theresa by which Silesia was confirmed to him. This defection left France without an ally in Germany; the defeat of the Pretender Charles Edward, who, after having penetrated to within twenty leagues of London, was vanquished at Culloden (1746), prevented a revolution which would have paralysed England for a considerable time. Maria Theresa and George II., free from all anxiety, the one on the side of Prussia, and the other on the side of the Jacobites, showed a renewed activity. Maria Theresa sought to compensate herself in Italy for her losses in Germany and for what she might yet lose in the Low Countries. The Franco-Spanish army, after a fruitless attempt on Savoy, had secured the county of Nice by the victory of Coni (1744) and the Piedmontese Apennines by an alliance with Genoa and the Duke of Modena. The Battle of Basignano gave them the Milanese (1745). But the empress sent superior forces into Italy. Lichtenstein assembled there 45,000 Austrians, to whom Maillebois could only oppose 28,000 men. The Battle of Piacenza (1746) and the defection of Spain gave the imperialists all the north of the peninsula. England (1745) had bombarded all the coast of Liguria and Genoa and attempted to support the King of Sardinia in an attack on Provence, capturing Lorient. The allies arrived within sight of Toulon, but this invasion suffered the fate of all the others. The energetic measures of Marshal Belle-Isle and the revolt of Genoa against the Austrians secured the retreat of the invaders.

Victories of Raucoux and Lawfeld (1746–1747).—In the south France could do no more than defend her frontier, and the excellent scheme devised by the minister d'Argenson for the expulsion of all foreigners from Italy and the union of all the states of the peninsula in an Italian confederation was defeated, to the great detriment of Italy herself and of the peace of the world. But in the north France gained brilliant successes. The Battle of Raucoux, won by Marshal Saxe, marked the year 1746. After each victory Louis asked for nothing but peace, though he added that he would treat as a king, not as a merchant. This implied disinterestedness was not credited, and Holland, alarmed at seeing the French near her gates, restored the stadtholdership, as had been done in 1672, sacrificing liberty on the altar of independence. Led by England, which was now among the foes of France, the Czarina Elizabeth (1747) concluded a treaty of subsidies and placed at the disposal of the enemies of France fifty Russian ships and 37,000 men who marched towards the Rhine. France, fighting single-handed against all these enemies, still advanced in the Low Countries, with the sword in one hand and peace in the other. Marshal Saxe won the Battle of Lawfeld (1747) and Count Lowendal took the impregnable Berg-op-Zoom. Holland was invaded and Saxe, by skilful manœuvres, succeeded in investing Maestricht (1747).

Naval Operations: La Bourdonnais: Dupleix.—France did not declare war against England until 1744, after the brilliant naval Battle of Toulon which was indecisive as so many naval battles have been. But this excellent beginning was not maintained. Brest and Toulon were blockaded by the English; Antibes was bombarded and Lorient was saved only by a panic which seized the English and caused them to fly to their ships, instead of entering a town which was ill defended. With thirty-five vessels of the line France had to fight against 110. Her commanders at least made their defeat honourable by their heroism. On May 3, 1747, off Cape Finisterre, Marquis la Jonquière, to save a convoy for Canada, attacked seventeen ships with six, and was taken after a glorious resistance. "I have never seen such courage," wrote one of the victors. France retained in the Atlantic seven vessels; they were given to L'Estanduère to convoy a merchant fleet of 250 vessels. Near Belle-Isle he met Admiral Hawke with fourteen ships and to save the convoy accepted battle. The fight was bloody. Two ships, the *Tonnant* and the *Intrepide*, made their way through the victorious fleet and returned to Brest, the English admiral holding a court martial on those who had

allowed them to escape. "In this war," as an English historian has said, "the victories of England were only the result of superior numbers." In America, Louisburg was taken from France, as well as Cape Breton Island at the mouth of the St. Lawrence. In the Indies, France had two men who, if they had been able to agree and if they had been supported, would have given her Hindustan—La Bourdonnais and Dupleix. The former had created everything at Bourbon and the Ile de France, which he governed for the East Indian company, introducing culture, establishing fortifications, and arsenals. Engineer, general, and sailor—nothing checked him, and the Ile de France, having become, with its excellent harbour, the key of the Indian Ocean, La Bourdonnais sailed that sea and expelled the English. Dupleix, another man of genius, wished to expel the English from the mainland, imagining great projects. He desired the company, all of whose stations in India were under his administration, to become great territorially as well as commercially. For success to be secured it was essential that these two men should work together. At the capture of Madras they had a mortal quarrel, and La Bourdonnais, recalled to France, was on his return confined in the Bastille on charges sent from India. Dupleix redeemed this ill-deed by the fine defence of Pondicherry (1748); he saved that town and inflicted a check on the English which was not without effect in Europe. Both in India and in the Low Countries peace came inopportunely for France, but the French fleet was reduced to two ships, her debt had risen to 1,200,000,000, and the king, incapable of doing violence to himself any longer, demanded that he should be left to his pleasures. England, which feared to see France permanently established at the mouth of the Scheldt, at last agreed to treat.

Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle (1748).—The Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle (April, 1748) stipulated for a mutual restoration of conquests. England recovered for four years the *asiento*, the right of importing negroes, and the *vaisseau de permission* (*permissory ship*) in the Spanish colonies. Austria ceded Parma and Piacenza to the Infant Don Philip, Silesia to the King of Prussia, and many places in the Milanese to the King of Sardinia. France restored Madras and regained Cape Breton Island, but she kept nothing in the Low Countries, which had been almost entirely conquered, and she was still forbidden to fortify Dunkirk, except on the land side. English commissioners, paid by the French government, insured the execution of this clause, and when George demanded the expulsion of the Pretender, the

Stuart prince was arrested at the opera, as if to indicate that the English ministers exercised police rights even in Paris. Marshal Saxe, who might have expected a better result from his victories, did not long survive the treaty, dying at the age of fifty-four.

Commercial Prosperity.—The eight years which followed this peace were the brightest period of French commerce during the eighteenth century. Lorient, which in 1726 had been little more than a village, received in 1736 the equivalent of 18 millions in merchandise. If La Bourdonnais was no longer at the Ile de France, his memory, his lessons still lived; Bourbon became a great agricultural colony. Dupleix, relying on the support of the native princes, attempted to create a vast colonial empire in India. In the Antilles, Guadeloupe, Martinique, and above all San Domingo, reached a degree of prosperity which affected the trading towns of the mother land; Nantes and Bordeaux benefited especially and still regret those days of riches; Marseilles flourished also, having a monopoly of the trade of the Levant. The sugar and coffee of the French West Indian islands captured the European market from the sugar and coffee of the English plantations, and Louisiana, which had not been prosperous, found in the free trade which was granted to it in 1731 a fortune which had been unobtainable under the monopoly.

The maritime war only suspended this movement; on the restoration of peace, it was resumed energetically and supported by the government since, despite the inertia of Louis XV. and the disastrous influence of Madame Pompadour, the increasing strength of public opinion forced certain men on the government and certain actions. The Marquis d'Argenson was thus called to the ministry of foreign affairs (1744) as were Rouillé and Machault to the ministry of marine, these ministers making praiseworthy efforts to re-establish the fleet. In 1754, there were fifty ships of the line, thirty-one frigates, and twenty-one other vessels in the French navy. England, with 243 men of war, including 131 ships of the line, was not jealous of the French marine, imposing in numbers perhaps, but lacking everything else. Yet she showed some alarm at the revival of French naval power and still more at the growth of French commerce, which had received a great impulse when the duty of fifty sous a ton was doubled by Machault in 1749, and she easily found a cause for a renewal of war.

Causes of the Seven Years' War.—When it is desired to make peace at any price, the peace is never enduring. Madame

Pompadour had said to the plenipotentiaries sent to Aix-la-Chapelle, "Remember that you must not return without peace; the king wills it." The result was that what should have been kept was surrendered, and that no care was taken to remove the grounds of dispute. France had magnificent possessions in America, Canada, Louisiana, the valley of the St. Lawrence, and that of the Mississippi, the two greatest rivers of North America, each extremity of which she thus held. Commissioners were appointed to define the frontier. They could not agree, and the colonists, drawing the Indians into their quarrels, began hostilities. Washington, still very young, became famous in these encounters, though in an unfortunate manner. The detachment which he commanded surprised and killed Jumonville with his escort, when that officer came to summon the English to evacuate the Ohio valley and to retire behind the Alleghany range. This was the first blood shed in the war (May 28, 1754). In the next year, without a declaration of war, the English admiral, Boscawen, captured two ships of the line; the French ministry protested, but for six months failed to follow up words with deeds. Meanwhile the English took more than 300 merchantmen, laden with cargoes valued at 30,000,000 livres, and manned by 10,000 sailors, the majority of whom were enrolled in the English service. The inevitability of war had to be recognised and France resigned herself to this fact.

The Diplomatic Revolution (1756).—It was to the interest of France that the war should be purely a naval war, and that all her strength should be directed to the duel with England. But England had no intention of letting this occur. The English ministry, thanks to its gold, once more brought about a continental war, offering subsidies to all who would declare against France. Prussia accepted the offer, feeling that she was threatened by the unexpected reconciliation between France and Maria Theresa. The latter, who could never restrain her tears at the sight of a Silesian, had an implacable hatred for Prussia and proposed an alliance to the court of Versailles on the basis that Silesia should be restored to Austria, that the Low Countries should then be ceded to a Bourbon of the Spanish branch, Mons and Luxemburg passing to France. A friendly letter from Maria Theresa to Madame Pompadour, whom the proud empress addressed as "her very good friend," secured the reversal of the secular policy of France. By the Treaty of Versailles (1756), which was wholly to the advantage of Austria, since the promise of the Low Countries was withdrawn, the two

powers united after a rivalry which had cost much blood. Elizabeth of Russia, who was offended by the epigrams of Frederic; Sweden, which aimed at the recovery of Pomerania; and Saxony, which desired increased territory, joined the league. Austria thus became the friend of France and the foe of England, her old ally, while France prepared to attack Prussia, her recent ally. Such was the Diplomatic Revolution by which the system of European alliances was reversed.

The Seven Years' War (1756–1763): Conquest of Minorca (1756).—France, forced to fight both on land and sea, struck vigorous blows. She replied to the action of Boscawen by sending against Minorca, then an English possession, a squadron commanded by Le Galissonnière, who defeated the English fleet under Vice-Admiral Byng. France also sent an army under Marshal Richelieu, which took the supposedly impregnable fortress of Port Mahon by one of the finest feats of arms of the century. England revenged herself for this reverse like a second Carthage; the unhappy Byng was condemned to death and shot on his quarter-deck.

Difficult Position of the King of Prussia.—On the continent the war began with an invasion of Saxony by Frederic who, as always, anticipated his enemies. He surrounded the Saxons in their camp at Pirna. The Austrians advanced to relieve the place: Ferderic hastened to meet them in Bohemia, defeated them at Lowositz, and on his return captured the whole Saxon army, which he incorporated with his own forces. France forthwith declared that the Treaty of Westphalia had been broken and placed two armies in the field. Marshal d'Estrées entered Westphalia, while Soubise marched towards the Main. Attacked by all his neighbours, supported only by England, Frederic would have been unable, despite his genius, to defend himself against this formidable coalition had the allies acted with any concert. But the Prussian king was aided by the ineptitude or slackness of the French generals, and by the dilatory methods of Daun, the Austrian commander-in-chief. From Saxony, which he had boldly occupied, Frederic returned to Bohemia and won the bloody Battle of Prague (1757). Defeated in his turn near that city, at Kollin, by Daun (1757), he was forced in his retreat to divide his army, which exposed him to a further reverse. At the same time, the Russians on the east took Memel and defeated Joegerndorf though they were unable to profit from their success. On the west, d'Estrées won the Battle of Hastembeck over the English, and occupied Hanover, while

another French army marched rapidly on Magdeburg and Saxony. The circle of enemies, by whom Frederic was surrounded, daily closed more nearly upon him, and he asked for peace. He was supposed to be beaten ; his offer was refused. He then decided that he would die a king, as he told Voltaire, and the incapacity of his foes saved him.

Capitulation of Klosterseven (1757).—Richelieu, who succeeded d'Estrées in the command of the army of Hanover, shut up the Duke of Cumberland in a cul-de-sac, in the midst of marshy country, but instead of making him prisoner, he granted him the capitulation of Klosterseven which the English government, under the leadership of the famous William Pitt, disavowed. Richelieu had made the mistake of not destroying this army which he found before him once more with strength unimpaired, and the fruits of two fortunate campaigns were lost. He committed a further blunder by setting his officers and soldiers an example of scandalous greed. On his return to Paris he built with the profit of his depredations an elegant house which the public sarcastically nicknamed *Pavilion de Hanovre*. The soldiers, whose looting he authorised, called him *le bon père la Maraude*. Discipline was thus weakened at the very moment when the French were called upon to face the Prussians, the best disciplined troops in Europe.

Battle of Rosbach (1757).—Soubise, the favourite of Madame Pompadour, was entrusted with the difficult task of facing the Prussians. He united his troops with the "army of execution" which the empire had raised to support Maria Theresa and marched upon Saxony. Frederic hastened from Silesia to the Saale ; he had only 20,000 men against 50,000. He posted himself, not far from the famous fields of Jena and Auerstadt, at the village of Rosbach on some heights, concealing his cavalry behind some rising ground and his formidable artillery behind the tents of his camp. The allies advanced rashly, without order, to the sound of fanfares, being deceived by the seeming hesitation of the king and believing that he was about to retreat. Suddenly the Prussian artillery was unmasked and fired ; the cavalry hurled themselves on the right flank of Soubise which that general had believed to be free from danger of attack, and the Prussian infantry followed. The allied army was dispersed in a short time ; the Prussians killed only 3000 men, for there was little fighting, but they made 7000 prisoners, took 63 cannon, and lost only 400 soldiers. Soubise wrote to Louis XV., "I address myself to your Majesty in an access of despair. The

rout of your army is complete; I cannot tell you how many officers are slain, taken, or missing." But a more terrible judge than the king, the public, began to appear at this time and to punish with mordant satires the inexperience of generals and the faults of ministers. The popular songs ran :—

"Soubise dit, la lanterne à la main:
J'ai beau chercher où diable est mon armée;
Elle était la pourtant hier matin.
Me l'a-t-on prise, ou l'aurais-je égarée?
Ah! je perds tout, je suis un étourdi."

Battle of Krefeld (1758).—Frederic allowed Soubise to escape in order to turn against the Austrians, whom he expelled from Saxony. He pursued them into Silesia and defeated them at Lissa, a battle in which he repeated the manœuvre of Rosbach, theatening one wing and crushing the other (1757). Pitt, who at this time became prime minister in England, made greater efforts in support of his ally. The king, in exchange for numerous subsidies voted to him under the influence of Pitt, lent one of his lieutenants, Ferdinand of Brunswick, to command the Hanoverian army which violated its oath and re-entered the campaign. Before this able general the French fell back, recrossing the Weser, Ems, and Rhine, after having been again defeated at Krefeld (1758). The general who conducted this inglorious retreat was the Count of Clermont, a member of the family of Condé, Abbé of St. Germain des Prés. This title afforded material for jests; Frederic called him the general of the Benedictines, and at Paris they sang :—

"Moitié plumet, moitié rabat,
Aussi propre à l'un comme à l'autre,
Clermont se bat comme un apôtre,
Il sert son Dieu comme il se bat."

Disorders in the Army and Administration of France.—Napoleon said of the courtiers whom the caprice of Madame Pompadour placed at the head of the French armies that all, whether generals in chief or generals of division, were of the most perfect incapacity. It may be added that the quarrels of the court were continued in the camp and that many were accused, not unjustly, of defeating the plan of campaign and losing battles in order to ruin an adversary. Not only were the tacticians incapable, but the administration was deplorable. The armies were ill-composed and worse supported. When Clermont succeeded Richelieu, he had to cashier eighty officers. With the army of Soubise there appeared at one time 12,000

merchants' carts and provision waggons; on the battlefield 6000 marauders were behind the lines. Nor was this the limit of the evil. As women ruled, the higher posts in the administration were distributed according to the most violent caprices. From 1755 to 1763 twenty-five ministers were called to office or removed, "Falling one after another, like the figures of a magic lantern," says Voltaire. Plans changed with the ministers, or rather no plans were made and all was left to chance.

Successes and Reverses in Westphalia: d'Assas.—But after the shameful reverses of Rosbach and Krefeld, if the generals were not changed they were given forces so superior to those of the enemy that even Soubise and Clermont, the Duke of Broglie and Marshal Contades, to some extent retrieved the fortunes of France, winning some of that success which in the previous years had fallen to the Prussians, Hessians, and Hanoverians.

Soubise was on the Main while Clermont was retreating. By threatening Hesse, where Broglie gained a slight success at Sondershausen near Cassel, he recalled Brunswick and defeated a division of his army at Lutzelberg (1758). Next year Broglie gained another and more important success at Bergen on the Nidda, but being placed under the orders of Contades he served him badly and the rivalry of the two generals produced another disaster at Minden (August, 1759). Contades suffered for it and was removed; Broglie was given his command with a reinforcement which raised his army to over 100,000 men. He did not know how to use them and contented himself with occupying some towns, Cassel and Minden, and with a success which Count St. Germain gained over the Prussians at Corbach (1760). A detachment on the Rhine had better fortune. A Prussian army of 20,000 tried to take Clèves; De Castries beat them at Klosterkamp. This was the scene of the devotion of the Chevalier d'Assas, captain of a regiment of Auvergne. Falling into an ambuscade by which the enemy hoped to surprise the whole French army, he shouted at the top of his voice, "A moi, Auvergne; here are the enemy." He was pierced with wounds, but the army was saved (1760).

Energy of Frederic the Great (1758–1762).—Thus in the west of Germany the war had no result except to lay waste the districts in which the French armies usually went into winter quarters. In the east and south Frederic himself was opposed to the Russians, who took Königsberg, but were beaten at Zorndorff near Custrin (1758), and to the Austrians, who killed 10,000 of his men at Hochkirchen in Lusatia. The Russians

revenged themselves in the next year at Zullichau and Kunnersdorff, where each side lost 20,000 men, and Frederic would have found himself in a difficult position if his enemies had known how to profit from their success. The brilliant victory of Brunswick at Minden revived the hopes of Prussia. Frederic used the return of fortune to ask for peace; his enemies, seeing in this overture only a proof of weakness, still declined to treat (1760). The king undeceived them. He defeated Laudon at Liegnitz, relieved his capital, which had been surprised by the Russians and Austrians, drove Daun out of a formidable position near Torgau, and remained master of two-thirds of Saxony, while his lieutenants checked the attempts of the French and Swedes in the north and west.

But "these labours of Hercules" had weakened the forces both of the king and of his people. During the whole campaign of 1761 Frederic was kept on the defensive. He had little success; if Broglie was beaten at Fillinghausen because he relied on Soubise, who failed to come to his help, the Prussians lost Schweidnitz and Dresden, and were deprived of the subsidies of England. The death of the czarina relieved the situation for Frederic, her successor, Peter III., declared the neutrality of Russia (1762), and Sweden at the same time retired from the war. At peace on the east and north, Frederic acted with vigour in Silesia, which he regained, and in Saxony, where Prince Henry won the Battle of Freyberg. France, moreover, was about to follow the example of Russia.

Reverses of France at Sea.—France carried on the war on land without suffering any very serious reverses, though without winning any great degree of glory, since she had Austria and Russia as allies while Frederic had no ally. But at sea she was face to face with a foe whose crushing superiority left the sailors of France hope only of isolated success. The naval victory gained by La Galissonnière in 1756 was not repeated; but the honour of the French flag was maintained in a number of isolated combats. In the straits of Rochefort two French frigates attacked an English frigate and ship of the line and disabled them. One of the French captains, Maureville, having lost his arm, cried at the boarding bridge to his men, "Courage, my friends; I forbid you to yield." There were many similar instances. But while England devoted all her attention to her navy, the French government allowed the colonies to be left without ships, soldiers, or money. Discipline was undermined by unfortunate disputes; the gentlemen officers, called *officiers*

rouges, despised the rankers, *officiers bleus*, and refused to obey them. Courts-martial and desertions resulted and the service deteriorated. The English blockaded the French ports; not a ship sailed which did not fall into their hands; thirty-seven ships of the line and fifty-six frigates were thus taken, burned, or wrecked. Descents made by the English on the coasts of Normandy and Brittany, at Cherbourg and St. Malo, had no permanent results, but indicated that the territory of France might be attacked with impunity as the fleet could not protect its shores. In one of these expeditions upon St. Malo the enemy lost at St. Cart 5000 men, whom the Duke of Aiguillon and the gentlemen of Brittany attacked in a body, killed, or captured (1758). In the following year Admiral la Clue, with only seven vessels against fourteen, was beaten at Cap Ste. Marie, and the rashness of Conflans resulted in the loss of the Brest fleet. In 1763 the English captured Belle-Isle; they thus secured in the Bay of Biscay opposite Nantes, between Brest and Rochefort, the same advantageous position that Jersey gave them off the coast of Brittany opposite St. Malo, between Cherbourg and Brest. All the French coast on the Atlantic, from Dunkirk to Bayonne, was practically in a state of siege.

Reverses in the Colonies.—Dupleix had been recalled in 1745; had France sent him money and good soldiers instead of sending, as he complained, *la plus vile canaille*, India would perhaps now belong to France and not to England. Dupleix died at Paris in misery in 1763. An Irishman in the service of France, Lally, without having broad views, had at least indomitable courage. But being obliged to raise money to make war on the Indian rajahs fifty leagues inland, he could not prevent the English, commanded by the able Clive, from regaining the advantage. He attacked Madras, the breach was opened; he ordered the assault, but his soldiers refused to advance because they had not been paid. In his turn Lally was besieged in Pondicherry, where with 700 men he defended himself for nine months against 22,000. The English, eventually masters of the town, expelled the inhabitants and razed it to the ground. This was the death-blow of French domination, which has never revived in India.

And in the same way in Canada the French flag was raised high, only to be brought down. Marquis Vaudreuil and the Marquis of Montcalm took the forts of Oswego and St. George, on the lakes of Ontario and St. George, outposts of the English dominion (1756). But in 1759 the French had only 5000 soldiers

to oppose to 40,000 and the colony lacked foodstuffs, lead, and powder. Madame Pompadour cost France three or four millions a year; for lack of a like sum the country was unable to send to Canada 4000 soldiers who would have remained as colonists after the war and who would have changed the issue of the struggle. The English besieged Quebec; Montcalm accepted battle to save the city: mortally wounded, he still cried to his men, whose idol he was owing to his chivalrous courage, "Forward and hold the battlefield." The English general, Wolfe, struck by three bullets, heard in his death agony his men shouting, "They fly!" Raising himself for a moment, he said, "I die content." Vaudreuil still fought on for a time, but in the end Canada was lost. Guadeloupe, Dominica, Martinique, Grenada, St. Vincent, St. Lucia, Tobago, St. Louis in Senegal, and the Isle of Gorée were lost also.

Choiseul: The Family Compact (1761).—At this moment an able minister secured the chief influence over the affairs of France, the Duke of Choiseul. Madame Pompadour recalled him from the embassy at Vienna to give him the portfolio of foreign affairs (1758), which he exchanged in 1761 for that of war. Two years later, he also assumed the ministry of marine, while the ministry of foreign affairs was given to his cousin, the Duke of Praslin. Choiseul preserved the Austrian alliance, but he negotiated another alliance. He wished to gather, as in a sheaf, all the branches of the Bourbon house, established in France, Spain, the Two Sicilies, Parma, and Piacenza; to realise the dream of Louis XIV. and to give France the valuable support of the Spanish navy. This treaty, the famous *pacte de famille*, was signed on August 15, 1761, the contracting powers mutually guaranteeing each other's territories. England soon declared war on Spain, and induced Portugal to follow her example. The French navy had fallen to a low point, that of Spain was languishing, with the result that their union produced no immediate result. Spain, which had entered the war too late, suffered only losses; Manilla, the Philippines, and Havana, twelve ships of the line, and a 100 millions in prizes were taken from her. An invasion of Portugal had no result.

Treaties of Paris and Hubertsburg (1763).—By 1762 the powers, whether victorious or defeated, were weary of a war which had ruined them all and which had cost the lives of a million men. France on her side had spent 1350 millions. England had attained her object, the destruction of the French navy and mercantile marine. But even her conquests had exhausted her

treasures, her national debt was increased, recruiting had become difficult, since to preserve that empire of the ocean which she had seized she had constantly to increase her armaments. Prussia, without commerce or industry, devastated and depopulated, was sustained only by the energy of her king. Austria had wished to seize Silesia from Prussia and now despaired of doing so. France and England signed preliminaries (November 3, 1762) which developed into the Treaty of Paris (February 10, 1763). By it, England acquired Canada with its 60,000 French inhabitants, Acadia, Cape Breton Island, Grenada and its dependencies, St. Vincent, Dominica, Tobago, Senegal, and in Europe, Minorca. France preserved the right to fish on the coast of Newfoundland and in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, with the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon, but was not permitted to fortify them. She recovered Guadeloupe, Marie-Galante, Désirade, and Martinique, and obtained St. Lucia. The island of Gorée in Senegal and that of Belle-Isle off Brittany were restored to her. But she demolished once more the fortifications of Dunkirk and accepted the insulting presence of a resident English commissioner to prevent the restoration of those quays from which Jean-Bart had sailed. In the East Indies, Pondicherry, Mahé, and three small factories in Bengal were left to her on condition that they were not garrisoned. Spain, while regaining Cuba and Manilla, lost to England Florida and the bay of Penascola, France compensating her some time later by the cession of Louisiana. By the Treaty of Hubertsburg, between Austria and Prussia, Silesia was left to Frederic. "The war began for two or three wretched villages. The English gained two thousand leagues of territory, and humanity lost a million men," such was the judgment of the Prussian king.

Political and Military Decadence of France.—The Seven Years' War had been undertaken for the ruin of the King of Prussia; he emerged from it victorious, and a new state, lately a mere electorate, took its place among the great powers of Europe. As a result both Austria and France were weakened. At the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, France still appeared to be the first military power, thanks to the victories of Marshal Saxe, which had revived something of the glory of the reign of Louis XIV. But the Seven Years' War showed the worthlessness of the French generals, the want of discipline in her soldiers, and, despite some happy exceptions, the decline of military qualities in France. At sea, it was not a case of decay but of complete ruin.

Attempts of Choiseul to revive the Navy: Acquisition of

Corsica (1768) and of Lorraine (1766).—Choiseul, a patriotic if not a great minister, earnestly desired to raise France from the abyss into which she had fallen. He tried to reorganise the army and to render the transition from a peace to a war footing more easy. He resumed the work of Machault towards the creation of a fleet. Life returned to the ports and England saw with grief the rebirth of that navy which she believed that she had destroyed. When Choiseul fell there was a fleet of sixty-four ships of the line and fifty frigates or corvettes, which soon afterwards, in the American War, disputed the command of the sea with the English squadrons. Some deeds and some energetic works showed that France was reviving after her reverses. An Englishmen, taken at the moment when he had stolen the plans of the fortifications of Brest, was put to death without the English ambassador daring to complain. Corsica revolted against its old masters, the Genoese; it was occupied, conquered, and united to France, and England was content to make a hero of Paoli, who had commanded the Corsicans against the French. The island was acquired in 1768, just in time to enable Napoleon to be born a French subject in 1769. Three years later, the death of Stanislas Leczinski led to the reunion of Lorraine with France. That prince had earned blessings by his paternal rule and his memory still lives at Nancy, which is proud of the monuments with which he decorated the town. These were acquisitions without glory but of value, and at which England groaned. Choiseul did not trouble to soothe her. Some English, having established themselves in a Spanish island in America, were expelled; England threatened Spain with war, and Choiseul at once prepared to assist the ally of France, raising formidable armaments which caused England to reflect. At the same time he encouraged the growing unrest in the English colonies; he detached Portugal and Holland from the English alliance and prepared that union of the secondary maritime powers which some years later became the Armed Neutrality against those who claimed to rule the seas.

At the other end of Europe, Choiseul tried to strengthen the Swedish government against the intrigues of Russia, and stretched out a friendly hand to Poland, which, suffering from the vices of its constitution, sank daily lower into the abyss. Had he succeeded, a barrier would have been formed against the Colossus of the North, which since the time of Peter the Great had not ceased to expand, its head at the pole, its feet resting on the Danube, one arm stretched towards the Baltic, and the

other already resting upon Poland. Only one reverse was sustained in foreign policy, the failure of an unhappy attempt to colonise Guiana.

Suppression of the Jesuits (1762).—One important act of the administration of Choiseul, though it was not directly his work, was the suppression of the Jesuits. That mighty society had spread everywhere. After having fought vigorously in the sixteenth century against Protestantism, and having directed and dominated Catholicism during the seventeenth, it had allowed abuses to grow up within its own body as a result of too prolonged good fortune. Pascal, under Louis XIV., had already attacked its lax morality in his *Provincial Letters*. The Jansenists had continued the struggle. Parliament distrusted an army so devoted to the holy see, which had no longer France as its native land, and the philosophers applauded every blow that was struck. Presently hatred for them became almost universal in Europe. In 1717 they had been expelled from Russia and in 1759 they were banished from Portugal. La Valette, administrator of the Jesuit missions in the Antilles, who had united commercial to religious activities, went bankrupt for a sum of 3 millions, and this led to an inquiry. The trial resulted in an examination of the constitution of the order; it was found that the society was contrary to the interest of the state, and the Jesuits, condemned by a decree of parliament in 1762, were suppressed two years later by a royal edict. Spain and Naples followed this example (1767), as did Parma (1768). Pope Clement XIII. protested in vain by a bull which continued the Jesuits in all their rights. The papacy was obliged to give way to the vigorous representations of the Catholic powers, and Clement XIV. in 1773 solemnly pronounced the suppression throughout Christendom of the Society of Jesus. There were at this time about 20,000 Jesuits, of whom 4000 were in France.

Fall of Choiseul (1770).—Choiseul had many enemies. The Jesuits left behind them a powerful party which did not forgive the minister for their expulsion. Their pupil, the dauphin, was hostile. The Duke of Aiguillon, who had been recalled from his government of Brittany; the Chancellor Maupeou; Abbé Terray, the controller of the finances, formed against him a secret triumvirate which would have been powerless without a shameful ally that it secured. To Madame Pompadour, who died in 1764, there had succeeded the Countess du Barry, whose mere presence was a disgrace to Versailles. Choiseul refused to bow to her disgraceful influence; she swore to ruin him and

besieged the king with requests for his dismissal. The triumvirate urged her on and gave her definite grounds for her request. The king was told that Choiseul was the head of the philosophers and the vicious monarch detested freedom of thought; he was told that Choiseul was the friend of the parliaments and Louis was angry at their interference in public affairs; he was told that Choiseul dreamed of war and Louis desired peace. Finally the intrigue triumphed; in 1770 Choiseul was banished to his lands at Chanteloup, near Amboise, where he was followed by a large crowd of partisans and friends who did not fear now to abandon the court, so greatly had times changed. Louis XV. one day uttered a eulogy on his fallen minister, which was his own condemnation. When he learned that Russia, Austria, and Prussia were about to partition Poland, he cried, "Ah, this would never have occurred if Choiseul had still been here." Choiseul never resumed office, but his influence on Marie Antoinette allowed him still to serve France indirectly by bringing pressure to bear on the king to support the Americans.

Destruction of the Parliaments (1771).—During the whole century, the parliaments had shown to the court, to ultramontane pretensions, and to increasing taxation a spirit of opposition which had not been always dignified or wise, especially in religious questions, as in the case of the bull *Unigenitus*. The government had accepted this bull as the law of the state, but the Jansenists rejected it; they were supported by the parliaments, animated at the time by a very Gallican spirit, and thus little favourable to the Roman Church in matters of discipline. The Archbishop of Paris, Christopher de Beaumont, forbade the priests of his diocese to administer the communion to such as were not provided with a *billet de confession*, bearing evidence that they had recognised the bull, and according to this order the sacrament was refused to a councillor and to the nuns of St. Agatha. Parliament was roused. It caused the bishop's orders to be burned by the common hangman and ordered the temporalities of the see of Paris to be sequestrated. The aid of the law was called in to force priests to administer the communion to the sick (1752). The philosophers heard and applauded these strange disputes and this violence, which discredited the magistracy, the episcopate, and even religion itself.

The magistrates were exiled for a first time in 1753; on their return they showed the same boldness. In vain the king enjoined absolute silence on religious matters. Parliament suppressed a brief of Benedict XIV. which, while softening the bull and the

rigour of the French clergy, authorised both. The parliament of Paris next tried by union with the other parliaments to form a body sufficiently powerful to assume towards the royal authority the position of the States-General. The king ordered the magistrates to confine themselves to their ordinary functions; a hundred and twenty-four resigned. There was extreme excitement in Paris. A madman, Francis Damiens, made an attempt on the king's life; Louis was only slightly wounded and Damiens was quartered (1757). The quarrel was revived at the trial of the Jesuits in 1762 and reached its culminating point in 1770.

The parliament of Brittany had long struggled against the Duke of Aiguillon, governor of the province. The procurator-general, La Chalotais, openly accused the duke, who freed himself of his accuser by throwing him into prison. But Aiguillon was removed; the parliament of Rennes instituted a process against him, and as the duke was a peer of France the case was taken to Paris, where the parliament would have condemned the accused had not the king by a *lit-de-justice* stopped the proceedings. The magistrates then declared that, "in their profound grief they had not spirit free enough to enable them to pronounce judgment concerning the goods, life, and honour of the king's subjects." The administration of justice was suspended. At this moment Choiseul was dismissed and succeeded by Aiguillon, a step which announced severe measures against the parliament. On the night of January 19–20, 1771, 169 magistrates were roused by the arrival of two musketeers who ordered them to sign yes or no to an order that they should resume their functions. Only thirty-eight signed yes and they retracted their assent on the following day. The next night an officer announced to them the abolition of their offices and musketeers brought them *lettres de cahier* relegating them to different places. By the end of the year 700 magistrates were in exile. Maupeou then formed a new parliament which was jestingly named after him and which was regarded with universal amusement. The adventure of one of its members, the notorious Goezman, who was convicted by Beaumarchais in his brilliant and popular memoirs of having been bribed, struck the new assembly a severe blow. "Sire, we may hope that your parliament will be a success; it has begun to take," said the Count of Noailles to the king.

The gravest features of the situation were that public opinion was deeply stirred and that opposition was found even in the court, all the princes of the blood save one and thirteen peers protesting against the overthrow of the laws of the state. At

the same time the terrible name of the States-General was uttered in the parliaments of Toulouse, Besançon, Rouen, and even at Paris, where the court of aides, by the mouth of the virtuous Lamoignon de Malesherbes, pronounced the following words, "For the first time, sire, since the foundation of the monarchy we see the confiscation of goods and of offices decreed on a simple accusation and by a decision of your council. The people have in the past possessed the consolation of being able to present their complaints to the kings your predecessors, but for a century and a half the States have not been convoked. Until this moment the representations of the courts have supplied the lack of those of the States, though imperfectly, but now this last resource has also been taken away. The nobles who are nearest your Majesty are forced to keep silence, as access to the throne appears to be closed even to the princes of the blood. Ask then, sire, the nation itself, since it can no longer make you hear its voice." The nation was soon to realise itself, but it was also to reconstruct everything, to destroy and ruin all. Richelieu and Louis XIV. had humbled the nobles politically; Louis XV. had struck heavy blows at the magistracy, and there was nothing left to support the old edifice of state and to cover the monarchy.

Pacte de Famine: Lettres de Cachet: Bankruptcy.—Every day the shame of the monarchy increased. In 1773 Austria, Russia, and Prussia partitioned Poland, France being unable to do anything to prevent this execution of a people. In 1767 the association nicknamed the *Pacte de Famine* was allowed to renew its lease for the monopoly of grain and thus to create the artificial famines of 1768 and 1769. The *lettres de cachet* were enormously increased and the liberty of citizens was handed over to the rich or powerful who had a passion to satiate or vengeance to gratify. Abbé Terray was in control of the finances; he regarded the people as a sponge to be squeezed, and forgot that over-taxation is disastrous for the treasury, since it prevents the formation of capital or destroys that which has been formed. He changed the whole system of contribution, with the result that the taxes became more crushing. Misery increased and the revenue did not; Terray found no remedy but bankruptcy to meet the obligations of the state. To the complaints which were heard on all sides he answered coldly, "The king is master; necessity knows no law." Yet even so, he left an annual deficit of 41 millions, though since 1715 the taxes had been doubled, rising from 165 millions to 365 millions. Louis XV. saw clearly that a terrible day of reckoning was approaching; in his egoism

he consoled himself with the thought that the blow would fall on another's head. "It will last my time; my successor must meet it as well as he can," he said, and Madame Pompadour repeated with him, "After us, the deluge."

CHAPTER LVII

STATE OF FRANCE AT THE END OF THE REIGN OF LOUIS XV.

Spirit of Criticism.—But there is a view to be taken of this period other than that of the unhappy wars and shameful government of France—the intellectual movement which took place. There had never been so lively a curiosity in all things, so great a daring in adventuring upon unknown paths. For a long time men had consoled themselves for an abuse by an epigram and for an injustice by a song; "They sing and then they pay," said Mazarin. But now they sang less; the public mind had become more serious and more formidable. In face of a monarchy which seemed to degrade itself from love of degradation, of a nobility which could no longer supply generals, of a clergy which produced too few Bossuets and Fénelons, the question of rights came to be debated and the titles of these once venerated powers were examined.

The chief work of monarchy in modern society had been to create unity of territory and unity of command by destroying that feudalism which made each fief a state and gave a thousand chiefs to every country in Europe. The struggle began in France in the twelfth century and was completed by Richelieu and Louis XIV. in the seventeenth. But vanquished feudalism left the land strewn with its debris. In every direction, in regard both to persons and things, there was the utmost inequality, the strangest confusion.

I. Political Conditions: Ill-Defined Powers of the Government.—The constitution was not a written one; everything rested on custom; nothing had greater validity than that possessed by an opinion, and as opinion varied so everything else varied incessantly. In theory the monarchy was absolute; in fact it was not; for numerous interests and powers, traditions and precedents which had attained the strength of fundamental laws formed a series of obstacles to the crown. As a result no one had defined rights, and as political sense was no less lacking than political institutions, all attempted to encroach on the domain

of others and no one kept to his own place. The ministers on occasion interfered with justice, as the parliaments interfered with the law, both doing violence to the one and the other. A royal edict was not valid until it had been registered in the parliament, but the council of state issued *arrêts en commandement* which dispensed with this formality. The clergy and the nobles had tribunals of their own; the third estate held public offices which they had bought; for the greater number of offices the king had despoiled himself of one of his chief prerogatives, the right of calling the ablest and best men to the service of the state.

Faulty Administrative Organisation.—There were six ministers. The chancellor was at the head of justice, but had hardly any importance when he did not bear the seals. The controller-general of the finances and the four secretaries of state, for the royal household, war, marine, and foreign affairs, were the other ministers. They exercised a curious medley of functions and divided the kingdom geographically between them. Thus the governors and lieutenant-governors of provinces were not responsible to the minister of war, but the posts were, as well as Dauphiné and the lands conquered after 1552. The minister of marine was also minister of foreign commerce, and the consuls and the chamber of commerce of Marseilles were responsible to him. The minister of foreign affairs regulated pensions and administered the provinces of Guienne, Normandy, Champagne, Berry, and others. The minister of the royal household controlled ecclesiastical affairs and *lettres de cachet*, as well as Languedoc, Paris, Provence, Brittany, Navarre, and other provinces. The controller-general looked after bridges and roads, hospitals, prisons, epidemics, internal commerce, and agriculture. There were various types of administrative division. There were circumscriptions of the thirty-four intendancies of the twenty-five *généralités;* of the forty governments or provinces; of the 135 archbishops and bishops, or dioceses; of the seventeen parliaments and sovereign courts; of the twenty-two universities—and none of these corresponded with one another.

One of the most deplorable principles of the administration was the habit of raising money by the creation of useless places which burdened the public. "Pontchartrain," says St. Simon, "raised in eight years 150 millions with parchment and sealing wax." He created *jurés crieurs héréditaires d'enterrements; essayeurs de bière de Paris, contrôleurs des perruques,*[1] and a

[1] A hereditary jury in charge of interments; beer-tasters of Paris; controller of wigs, etc.

thousand like offices. This abuse had another and remarkable effect; the number of officials so exceeded the needs of the services that they only officiated in turn. Thus at the *grenier à sel* at Paris, the office for dealing with the *gabelle*, the officials performed their functions for a year at a time; the registrars only exercised theirs once every three years.

Judicial Organisation.—Thirteen parliaments and four provincial councils were sovereign courts for civil and criminal cases; more than 300 bailiwicks or *sénéchaussées* judged in the first instance. There was a public prosecutor, an official unknown to the ancients, but there were no justices of the peace, an office created after the Revolution. The jurisdiction of the parliaments was very unequal. That of the parliament of Paris extended over two-fifths of France. There were also tribunals for the army, for commerce, for the nobles, and for the Church. The city courts had control of local police, though the senate of Strasburg could condemn to death. As for the spiritual judges, they could sentence to perpetual imprisonment and sometimes the chief seigniorial justiciar in order to prove his right condemned some one to be hanged who merited only banishment. The chamber of accounts, the court of *aides*, and the court of moneys dealt with all cases relating to taxes, money, and gold or silver. The great council, *the requêtes de l'Hôtel*, the tribunal of the University of Paris, the royal captains, and others had special jurisdictions. Certain persons could be tried only by certain courts.

Rigour of the Penal Code.—The civil law consecrated injustices, but the penal law ordered torture before judgment. It was prodigal, to a terrible extent, with sentences of mutilation, death, and the most horrible penalties, and while the accused was not allowed an advocate to defend him nor the cross-examination of his accusers, the judge had not even to give a reason for his decision. In 1776 a young man of nineteen, the Chevalier la Barre, was condemned without proof to be burned alive after having had his tongue and hand cut off, on account of a cross which had been destroyed on the bridge of Abbeville; four others condemned to the same penalties only escaped by flight.

Procedure was slow, complicated, conducted in darkness and silence, and sought rather a conviction than the truth; the accused was regarded as condemned and the innocent were often convicted. In 1770 Montbailly was broken on the wheel at St. Omer for a crime of which the superior court of Artois and the whole of France had three months earlier declared him

to be innocent. It was in vain that Voltaire made France and Europe resound with his eloquent protests against these deplorable judicial blunders; it was in vain that the work of Beccaria showed the true principles of criminal legislation and that the constantly increasing repeals of judgment warned the judges. Parliament opposed all reform and the President Dupaty needed all his perseverance and courage to save three men who had been unjustly condemned from being broken on the wheel. The magistracy, men of probity and enlightenment, were far better than the law, but the law was such that it exposed to error the most conscientious judge and made even the innocent tremble when accused. "If I were accused of stealing the towers of Notre-Dame, I should think myself lucky if I won acquittal," says a well-known man of the period. On the other hand, this society was so encumbered with relics of the Middle Ages that there was found existing in it a survival of the Merovingian period, the right of asylum existing in Paris in the enclosure of the Temple.

Exceptional Justice.—The nobles no longer conspired; there were no special commissions to hand over the accused to their proper judges. But the king often pronounced sentence of imprisonment or exile without trial, often without any term being fixed, and many cases were stopped by a *lit-de-justice* or by appeal to the grand council.

Expense of Justice.—Magistrates, registrars, officers of justice were either not paid at all or very ill paid; they compensated themselves by exacting payment from the suitors at a rate which they fixed. In so disorganised a society, when men were constantly coming into conflict with some privilege, some prohibition, or some obscure regulation, cases were innumerable, endless, and the suitors were handed over to the "brigandage of justice," as it was called by a contemporary lawyer. These exactions cost the suitors annually 40 million francs, or, according to a minister of Louis XV., nearly 60 million. The authority of the parliament of Paris extended in some directions for 150 leagues from the capital, another cause of ruin for the suitors who were compelled to seek expensive justice at a great distance.

Lack of Public Credit.—Credit is a power which develops in states in which the law is more powerful than the caprices of arbitrary authority. Therefore it did not exist in France and the government had less credit than private persons. "It was necessary to calculate the chances of the fulfilment of a contract by the government, as of an adventurous under-

taking," says Count Mollien. The most solemn promises having been broken a hundred times, the treasury could obtain advances only by giving some pledge, and even with this shameful condition it paid a usurious interest of 20 per cent. on advances secured on buildings and other property. At the same time the English government could borrow money at 4 per cent.; the financial strength of England was five times that of France. And war needs much money as well as courage and talent.

Faulty Administration of the Public Funds.—The public accounts were so badly kept that they were only drawn up ten, twelve, or fifteen years after the expiration of the contracts and agreements with which they were concerned. Everything was so obscure that no one, not even the minister, knew what the state had to pay or to receive. In 1726 Fleury abandoned to the farmers some accounts which the treasury had neglected; the farmers realised 60,400,000 livres. On the very eve of the Revolution, Calonne, Necker, and the notables were unable to discover the true amount of the deficit and of the public debt. Further, since Francis I. the public revenue was identified with the private revenue of the sovereign, with the result that the king delved deep into the common chest, taking money with no further formality than giving the treasurer a receipt for the money issued, *l'aquit de comptant.* Louis XV. took in a single year 180 millions mainly for his pleasures and his courtiers. In 1769, after six years of peace, the expenses exceeded the revenue by 100 millions, and certain revenues were mortgaged ten years in advance. There were future charges on the revenue to the year 1779.

Faulty Collection of the Public Revenue.—The taxes presented the strangest confusion and the government did not, as in the present day, collect them all. Indirect taxes were let out to companies of tax-farmers and to sixty farmers who called themselves "the columns of the state" and who destroyed rather than supported it. On the one hand they forced the treasury to pay usurious interest, on the other they increased their receipts by all possible means. Thus the product of the *don de joyeux avènement*, levied under Louis XIV., was abandoned to them for 23 millions and they collected more than 40 millions. Their scandalous fortunes are thus not surprising —one of them, Bouret, secured 42 millions—though they were forced to share with the courtiers to whom they paid their *croupes*, that is the pensions or shares proportionate to their

offices. Great nobles and great ladies received these shameful presents; Louis XV. himself held out his hand; he was a croupier.

The tax-gatherers had at their service a code so complex that the taxpayer could not know it, so rigorous that for the one crime of breaking the regulations of the *gabelle* alone there were constantly 1700 or 1800 persons in prison and more than 300 in the galleys. The treasury was not more lenient; if a receiver of the *taille* did not produce the amount due, the four principal persons in the district liable to the *taille* were taken, though they owed nothing personally, and kept in prison until they had made good the deficit. This was a revival of the odious Roman method which made the *curiales* responsible.

Defects in Military Organisation.—The regular peace army was 170,000 men, 131,000 infantry, 31,000 cavalry, and 8000 for the royal household, but the actual effectives were not more than 140,000 men. This included twelve Swiss regiments, eight German regiments, three Irish, one Swedish, and 21,000 coast-guard artillerymen, who hardly served except in time of war, as well as 60,000 provincial militia. The number of officers was extravagantly large. There were not less than 60,000 on the active and retired lists, and according to a regulation of 1772 a regiment of cavalry of 482 men contained 146 officers, commissioned and non-commissioned, that is, one officer for every three soldiers. Commissions were bought and those who could pay were able to become general officers without going upon active service. The Duke of Bouillon was a colonel at the age of eleven, the Duke of Fronsac at the age of seven; his major was twelve. Despite the reforms of Choiseul there were still many defects in the army and the system of enlistment produced unsatisfactory results. The regular army was recruited by voluntary methods, the militia by lot, 10,000 men being taken for service each year. But the drawing of lots was so badly conducted that it weighed especially heavily on the rural districts, was marked by the most scandalous abuses, and, if the volunteers made good soldiers, the recruiting officers often sent into the army the dregs of the large towns. There were annually some 4000 deserters.

Ecclesiastical Administration.—The clergy were divided into the *clergé de France* in the old provinces and the *clergé étranger* in the lands conquered since the time of Francis I. This distinction was important only from the point of view of taxation. But the bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun, suffragans of the

Archbishops of Treves or Mainz, and the five sees of Corsica, suffragans of Pisa or Genoa, did not share in the general assemblies of the clergy. The archbishopric of Besançon and that of Cambrai had on the other hand foreign suffragans. The sees were very unequal; that of Rouen contained 1388 parishes; those of Toulon and Orange twenty. The revenues were as unequal as the sees. The Bishop of Strasburg had an income of 500,000 livres, the Bishop of Gap 8000; and Fleury signed himself "by the divine indignation Bishop of Frejus." A great number of abbots possessed hardly 1000 livres of revenue; the Abbot of Fécamp had 120,000; the Abbot of St. Germain nearly three times that sum. Some of the curés were very rich, but the majority of the vicars were dying of want. Louis XVI. deserved recognition from them for fixing their salaries at 350 livres. Some had too much, some too little. The king appointed to all the charges of importance in the Church; the bishops, chapters, and nobles nominated to the other charges. Finally, 12,000 bishops, abbots, priors, and canons divided among them nearly a third of the revenue of the Church—some forty millions; the remaining two-thirds had to support eight times as many priests and monks. No mention need be made of the *petits abbés*, who were neither of the world nor of the Church and who scandalised both.

II. Social Conditions: Diversity in the Civil Law.—In place of one law there were 384 different customs, with the result that what was just in one province was illegal in another. Each parliament had its own regulations, and the diversity of legislation was still further increased by the diversity of jurisprudence.

Diversity in the Status of Individuals.—The three orders in the state, clergy, nobles, and commons, were distinguished by the privileges or offices which made the French people three distinct nations, each having its own hierarchy and its distinct classes. There was a *grand* and *petit noblesse;* the first lived at court on pensions, the latter in the country on slender revenues. There were the upper and lower clergy, the former very rich, the latter very poor. Among the commons, 50,000 families possessed the hereditary magistracies, forming a real aristocracy; the bourgeois despised the artisan; and the peasant at the bottom of the scale in misery and ignorance bore with anger all the weight of a society which crushed him. Even in the same family there was inequality, the right of primogeniture leaving to the younger sons of noble houses only the sword or the church, and to many daughters of those houses only the convent. Below the three

orders were the serfs, the Protestants, who had not even a civil status, and the Jews.

Diversity in the Condition of the Provinces.—Some provinces, the *pays d'États*, such as Languedoc, Burgundy, and Artois, had still a shadow of liberty in the management of their own affairs and were thus in a better situation. The other provinces, the *pays d'élection*, knew only the absolute orders of the king. The *pays d'élection* paid taxes; the *pays d'États* paid only a small proportion or did not pay at all. There were, as in Lorraine, the Three Bishoprics, Alsace, and the Pays-de-Labour, provinces which had no tariff against the foreigner; other provinces were surrounded by customs houses on all sides. In 1789 there were still in the south of France 1200 leagues of internal customs houses and the same measure of salt might be bought in one place for six and in another for sixty-two livres. The tax of the *vingtième* was less heavy in Lorraine, Alsace, and Franche-Comté than in the other provinces; Lorraine was not even subject to the capitation and as a result old France was more heavily taxed than the recently conquered provinces. Localities, corporations, and private individuals possessed privileges. At Paris even in 1783 the administration of the Invalides, of the military school, and of the Bastille, and various religious communities did not pay the *octroi* (city toll); from this a number of abuses arose, much merchandise being brought in nominally for the privileged, but really for other persons.

Inequality in Public Functions.—The nobles monopolised all offices. The nobles of the sword had the command of the army, of the highest dignities in the Church, and of the chief offices about the court and in the public service. The nobles of the robe had all judicial offices and the chief administrative posts. The commons could engage only in industry, commerce, and finance, though if they prospered in these they could buy letters of nobility and become marquises; they would then have to bear the sarcasm of those who had not yet bought rank and the deep contempt of those who had done so at an earlier date.

Inequality in Taxation.—The nation paid then almost as much as is paid at the present time. But three circumstances rendered the burden heavier then than it is now. There were more poor; the population was a third less numerous, and the incidence of taxation was most unequal. The clergy, who in addition to their vast property received a tithe from all land, noble and non-noble, paid nothing or next to nothing, making only gratuitous gifts, and when a minister talked of a tax on their revenues they

answered, " Do not place us in the position of having to disobey God or the king, for you know well what our choice will be." The nobles and the royal officials, save in some *généralités*, were not liable to the *taille* or land tax; they had to pay the other direct taxes, the capitation and the *vingtième* on revenues, though many found means to become wholly or partially exempt. The commons, who held only a third of the land of France, paid the *taille*, 91 millions; the *dime*, which was in some places a fortieth, in others a quarter, of their gross product, and which cost the agriculturists 133 millions; seigniorial rights, valued at 35 millions and the *corvée*[1] valued at 20 millions. For the great roads constructed under Louis XV. the state paid only the cost of mapping out the routes to be followed and of adorning them when made, while the materials and labour were furnished by means of the *corvée*, with a result that these public works, so profitable to the whole country, were executed at the expense of the people of the districts and amid their hatred.

Inequality in Justice.—A noble was executed, a commoner was hanged; though this was not important, being a mere difference in the form of death. But for the same fault committed together the Marchioness of Courcelles was sentenced to two years in an abbey convent, while Rostaing, who was only a commoner, was hanged and strangled (decree of 1669).

Servitude of Industry and Hindrances in the Way of Commerce.—Corporations, wardenships, and masterships checked the advance of industry by limiting the numbers of patrons (with the result that competition was destroyed) and by allowing only those who had paid for an apprenticeship to work at a trade, with the result that each was confined in his own craft as in a prison house. To become a master it was necessary to buy the privilege for three, four, or even five thousand livres, without including the cost of the specimen example of work, presents, and a banquet. And when all these charges had been paid it was still necessary to purchase the right to improve upon the given industry, an improvement being one of the prior rights of the corporation. The manufacturer of stuffs could not dye them; the dyer might not dye silks and wool as well as thread; the hatter might not sell hosiery. Hampered by minute regulations, the manufacturers were liable to see the police destroy their work owing to some oversight on their part or to some modification in the work which they had bought the right to produce. " Every week, for many years," said an inspector of manufac-

[1] Statute labour.

tures, " I have seen eighty or a hundred pieces of stuff burned at Rouen because some regulation as to texture or dyeing had not been observed, though the stuff was offered for sale as what it was." There was at this time only one coinage, that of the king, and since 1726 commerce had not been hindered by changes in specie or by sudden and official variations in the value of the silver mark.[1] But trade was still handicapped by diversities in weights and measures, which changed from town to town. The company of the Indies had up to 1770 by its commercial privileges impeded the efforts of private merchants. It had been lately abolished, but within the country business had still to contend with restrictions and injurious monopolies. Thus at Rouen one company was employed to provide grain for the city ; another to transport corn, and a third to grind it, to the great detriment of the inhabitants who were forbidden to secure supplies elsewhere. Grain did not even circulate from one province to another, with the result that jobbers could in certain places create a scarcity or abundance at will, could sell cheaply or at a very enhanced price. Interior customs houses isolated the provinces, rendered commercial relations between them as difficult as such relations with foreign lands, and caused the tolls to exceed the value of the products by 96 millions. In order to carry goods down the Saône and Rhône from Gray to Arles it was necessary to stop and pay thirty times, so that on this route, which nature alone had constructed, the tolls amounted to 25 or 30 per cent. of the value of the goods. Catholic districts had fifty feast days which the Protestant districts had not, and as a result the latter worked more and could sell at a better profit. Yet so flourishing were the colonies and so backward was the industry of Europe that the commerce of France prospered.

Decay of Agriculture.—Almost a fifth of the land of France, tied up in the hands of the Church, produced little, since it was not subject to the influence of private interest ; almost all the rest, cultivated by the farmers, did little better. The division of property had begun long before, but the lands in the possession of the peasants were heavily burdened with rents, a relic of ancient servitude. There was a small stock of cattle, and the land was consequently impoverished by lack of manure. Few of the great proprietors cultivated their own land ; a contemporary writer calculated that only 300 nobles lived on their estates. France suffered from the same evil as has afflicted Ireland, absenteeism. Vauban, Bois-Guilbert, complained that the culti-

[1] The silver mark varied in value from 36 to 54 livres.

vator was despised. In 1720 a decree of the council of state was needed to allow the nobles to take, without loss of status, the lands of the princes of the blood to farm. In 1788 a writer declared that the position of a labourer was looked down upon in the central provinces, though less so in Brie, Beauce, and Picardy. This contempt resulted from the profound misery in which the peasants lived, ruined by taxes, *corvées*, restrictions placed on the grain trade, and above all by the seigniorial rights of keeping warrens, dovecots, and hunts, which were so many scourges for the fields of the poor. St. Simon relates that when it pleased a Lord of Thouars, he sent to the Lord of Oiron, his vassal, to say that he would hunt on such a day in his neighbourhood and that he should level so many yards of his park wall that there might be no obstacles in the way of the hunt if it chanced to run in that direction. The excellent roads constructed under Louis XV. were only between the great cities, and the majority of the present means of communication are of comparatively recent date. In most provinces, all roads except the main roads were impassable for eight months in the year. Montesquieu states that lands are productive, less owing to their natural state than to the liberty of their inhabitants.

Insecurity of Individual Liberty and Property.—*Lettres de cachet* placed individual liberty at the discretion of the ministers and their friends ; property was threatened with confiscation, a penalty attached to all the laws, by the arbitrary power of the crown to create new taxes, by justice which was not always impartial, and by those decrees of suspension which released the nobles from payment of their debts.

> "Pauvre, on l'aurait frappé d'un arrêt légitime;
> Il est puissant; les rois ont ignoré son crime."

Malesherbes, president of the court of *aïdes*, told the king, in his famous remonstrance : "With the *lettres de cachet* in force, sire, every citizen is insecure from seeing his liberty sacrificed to vengeance, for no one is so great as to be securely sheltered from the hatred of a minister, and no one is so small as to be beneath the notice of a clerk of the farmers-general."

Liberty of Conscience denied.—The most severe regulations were in force against the dissenters. In 1746, 200 Protestants were condemned by the parliament of Grenoble alone to the galleys or to confinement for their creed ; in 1762 the parliament of Toulouse hanged a pastor who had performed the functions of his office in Languedoc and executed three young

men of good family who had armed themselves for defence against a Catholic riot. The same magistrates caused the Protestant Calas to be broken on the wheel, accused of having slain his son, who was anxious according to report to become a Catholic, and who had as a matter of fact committed suicide. Sirven and his wife only escaped a like fate in 1762 by flight.

Severity and Weakness with Regard to the Press.—There was a censorship, and even more than one, there being a censorship of the king, one of the parliament, and one of the Sorbonne. But they were frequently in conflict with each other. A book permitted by one would be burned by another; its price was raised and it circulated none the less, sometimes even under the protection of the ministers. The law inflicted the penalty of branding, the galleys, or death against the authors or sellers of books hostile to religion or the state; some unwise persons allowed themselves to be taken, but in general the administration shut its eyes and this mixture of excessive severity and blind tolerance only served to arouse public curiosity. The decrees of prohibition were read in order that books might be selected to read. The age was certainly regarded with justice as the period in which, according to the definition of Abbé Galiani, eloquence consisted in the art of saying everything without being sent to the Bastille. Fréret was sent there for a dissertation on the Franks; Leprévost de Beaumont, secretary of the clergy, was confined there for twenty-one years, until 1789, for having denounced in the parliament the *pacte de famine*.

General Misery.—All the evidence shows the terrible misery of the people. The peasants of Normandy lived largely on oats and dressed in skins. In Beauce, the granary of Paris, the farmers begged for part of the year. It was on occasion necessary to make bread of ferns. In a number of provinces the use of meat was unknown. According to one writer the consumption for three-quarters of the population of France in 1762 did not rise above a pound per head a month. Even the rich were poor, since the offices which they bought so dearly and which locked up such masses of capital were poorly paid by the state, hardly giving adequate interest on the money invested, while the vast estates, poorly cultivated, were unproductive. The doctor of Louis XV., Quesnay the *penseur*, as the king called him, estimated the total revenue from land, for the owners, at 76 millions only. The figure is doubtless too low, but it is certain that in the following century, while the population did not double, the produce of agriculture was quadrupled. In the same

period the amount of foodstuffs was increased three or four times and some old men remembered in the nineteenth century what wretched clothes the workmen, the men of the people, wore to protect them against the intemperate seasons.

"Certain wild animals," says La Bruyère, "male and female, dark, pale, burned by the sun, might be seen spread over the countryside, bound to the soil which they dug and which they tilled with a strange obstinacy. They had an articulate voice and when they rose to their feet they displayed a human face; in short, they were men. At night they retired into the hovels where they lived on black bread, water, and roots. They saved other men the trouble of sowing, working, and gathering for their food." The moralist was here a faithful historian.

Insufficiency of Safeguards against Misery and Sickness.—Hospitals were not lacking, as they had been multiplied by Christian charity, but the national capital and the help which could be given were very limited; bands of mendicants were constantly seen wandering over the countryside and alarming the towns. France had at that time some 800 civil hospitals, containing some 100,000 persons, but the mortality among them was frightful. At the Hôtel-Dieu in Paris it amounted to two in nine. Such was the insufficiency of supplies and the ignorance of the very simplest rules of hygiene that in this hospital, the richest in France, the sick of all kinds were herded together, even those who had infectious diseases, in the same rooms and even five or six in one bed, since there were only 1219 beds for 6000 individuals. At Bicêtre, said Necker in a report to the king, nine old men were found in one bed covered with rotten linen.

High Death-rate.—Having regard to all these circumstances, it is not surprising that the average duration of life was far less than it is at the present day.

Disaccord between Ideas and Institutions.—The Middle Ages, extinguished politically, survived in the social order. There was a profound disaccord between the constituent elements of society. As far as ideas and manners were concerned, the period was certainly the eighteenth century; as far as customs and most institutions were concerned, France was still in the thirteenth century. From the time when this difference was felt, a revolution was near, since new ideas called necessarily for new institutions. But new institutions were not desired either by the court or by those who lived on abuses as if on an inheritance. If a minister spoke of reform he fell. The writers tried to pierce this darkness, which the government had formed round itself in

thick clouds; a decree of the council absolutely forbade them to publish anything as to matters touching the public administration, and in 1768, twenty years before Mirabeau and the Constituent Assembly, some poor wretches were sent to the galleys for having sold some books, among them Voltaire's harmless production, *L'Homme aux Quarante Écus*.

Vauban: Bois-Guillebert: Fénelon: D'Argenson: Machault: Choiseul.—The government would have needed much glory and much strength to stamp out the torch which was illuminating public opinion. Louis XIV. had been successful while the torch still only threw out a few rare sparks; Louis XV. failed to put out the growing flame. The ruinous abuses, the wounding inequalities, the vast disorder, and the prevalent misery provoked inquiry. Vauban and Bois-Guillebert had demanded economic reforms; Fénelon demanded political reforms. Under the regency, the liberty and even the licence of thought corresponded to that of morals. The Duke of Bourbon in vain tried to check this impatient curiosity. Under his ministry the *Club de l'Entre-sol*, the first of its kind in France, was organised; Fleury closed it. But at the same time, the Marquis d'Argenson, a future minister, in his *Considérations sur le Gouvernement de la France*, written before 1739, demanded decentralisation, the abandonment of all local administration to municipal and cantonal councils, freedom of external and internal commerce, and the application of election by ballot to royal officials. This marquis, this minister, was not afraid to write these words, "It may be said that the principles set forth in the present treatise would be favourable to democracy, would destroy the nobility. Let there be no mistake. I only demand that the most foolish prejudice should be cast away to obtain the two things most needed to support the well-being of the state, that all the citizens should be equal among themselves and that men should be the sons of their labours. The nobles are the drones of the hive." Here one of the articles of faith of the Revolution was already announced. Another minister, Machault, proposed to replace the *taille*, which was paid only by the commoners, by a land tax, to which the privileged, nobles as well as priests, should be subject. Choiseul also spoke of reforms; to him, as to Colbert, the number of convents appeared to be excessive, and, like the States of Pontoise in 1561, he estimated that the suppression of the immunity of the Church from taxation in its vast domains would aid to a great degree in restoring the finances of the state, shattered as they were.

Increasing Mental Activity.—If such thought were formed in the minds of public men, it may be imagined what thought stirred those who undertook to examine social, political, and religious questions. Literature was not, as it had been in the previous century, confined within the domain of art; it had invaded all spheres and claimed to regulate all. The most virile minds in France appeared to be directed to the search for the public good. Men no longer laboured to produce good verses; they strove to produce good maxims. The caprices of society were no longer depicted for purposes of ridicule, but for purposes of reform. Literature became a weapon which all, the rash as well as the able, wished to use, and which striking out from all sides, without intermission, inflicted terrible and irremediable wounds. By a strange result, those who suffered most from this invasion of the political sphere by the writers were those who had most applauded. The society of the eighteenth century, frivolous, sensual, egoistical, had yet, in the midst of its vices, a taste for intellectual things. Talleyrand declared that those who had not lived in the years just before 1789 did not know the joy of life. Never were the salons so animated, politeness so exquisite, conversation so brilliant. Talent almost took the place of birth, and the nobles, with a smile on their lips and a chivalrous daring which recalled that of Fontenoy, fanned the flames of this stream of polemical literature which the sons of the bourgeoisie directed against them. Malesherbes says that there was then a noble enthusiasm which filled all minds.

Voltaire: Montesquieu: Rousseau.—Three men were the leaders of this movement, Voltaire, Montesquieu, and Rousseau. Voltaire, whose true name was Arouet, was born in Paris in 1694, his father being a notary and a native of Poitou. He saw only the sad years of the great king, and was one of the most ardent adherents of that reaction which appeared against the pietist habits of the reign of Louis XIV. At the age of twenty-one he was placed in the Bastille for a satire on Louis XIV. which he had not written; so early did he pay for his reputation of wit and malice. Having begun his career with his tragedy of *Œdipe*, filled with threatening verses (1718), and *La Henriade*, an apology for religious toleration (1723), he soon secured a name and was sought everywhere. But he soon realised the inconveniences of the high aristocratic society in which he was placed from his youth, and for which he was fitted by his brilliant and nimble mind, his fine and delicate temperament. A Chevalier de Rohan-Chabot having spoken of him with impertinence,

was soon chastised by one of those bitter sarcasms which Voltaire was so capable of producing, and revenged himself in the noble manner by having the writer beaten by his lacqueys. Voltaire, having no lacqueys, demanded reparation. Rohan-Chabot, once more cowardly, secured from the minister the imprisonment in the Bastille of this impertinent commoner who dared to challenge a gentleman. Soon set free on condition that he went abroad, Voltaire visited England, "to learn how to think." He remained there three years and brought back with him a knowledge of Locke, Newton, and Shakespeare, an ardent love for liberty of mind and speech, and still more for political freedom. On his return, his plays *Brutus* and *La Morte de César* showed on the French stage a reflection of the great English writer of tragedy, and his *Lettres anglaises* popularised the ideas of the wise philosopher and of the great astronomer. He did not escape persecution; his *Lettres anglaises* were burned by the common hangman.

Voltaire, who owed to Christian thought two of his great works, *Zaïre* and *Tancrède*, attacked the Church bitterly, and his first, his most sustained, efforts were directed against the spiritual rather than against the civil power. For his struggle he allied with sovereigns and was protected by them. He corresponded with Catherine the Great of Russia and with most of the German princes; he stayed at the court of Frederic II., a sceptical and literary prince, whose French verse he corrected. Finally he settled at the extremity of France, on the very frontier, that he might cross it at the first sign of danger, living at Ferney near Geneva. Thence there flew out on every wind light verse, letters, tragedies, romances, historical works, writings on science and philosophy which spread throughout Europe.

For good or ill, Voltaire represented his age. He was indifferent to the moral disorder, and if it was covered by a brilliant exterior he inclined to regard it as one elegance the more. As he grew old with the century, he adopted, like his time, more serious thoughts. Social evil became his personal enemy and the love of justice his most ardent passion. He succoured and defended the victims of judicial blunders; he was never weary of denouncing the numerous defects of legislation, jurisprudence, and public administration, and all the reforms which he desired in the civil order have been accomplished since his time. He was, in a measure, for fifty years the intellectual ruler of Europe, and justly merited the hatred of those who wished the world

to remain immobile, the admiration of such who conceived society as bound to work unceasingly for its material and moral amelioration.

The President Montesquieu (1689–1755), a man of calmer and graver mind, though he wrote the *Lettres persanes* (1721), apparently a light, but really a profound and terrible satire, spent twenty years in writing a single book, *L'Esprit des Lois*, but in it he raised an immortal monument to himself. "The human race has lost its title-deeds; M. de Montesquieu seeks to recover them," said Voltaire. Montesquieu sought out and explained the reason for civil and political laws; he explained the nature of governments; and if he condemned nothing, if the idea of change disturbed him, his preference was none the less clear for that English liberty which he offered for the admiration of France. When he visited Great Britain in 1729 he wrote, "In London there is liberty and equality." He was in error with regard to England, but sixty years before 1789 he produced the motto of the Revolution.

Rousseau, the son of a watchmaker of Geneva (1712–1778), only began to write in the middle of a long life, filled with errors, sorrow, and disappointment. At the age of thirty-eight he composed his first book, *Discours contre les Sciences et les Arts;* his second book, *L'Origine de l'Inégalité parmi les Hommes*, was another attack on the whole social order. In *L'Émile* he sketched a chimerical plan of education; in *Le Contrat social* he proclaimed the principle of national sovereignty and of universal suffrage, placing beside these great truths errors no less great, always expressing himself with singular eloquence.

The eighteenth century, at once so young and so old, had conventional feelings; it only knew the human soul as it appeared in the pursuit of pleasure, nature as depicted in the boudoirs and gardens of Versailles. Rousseau gave this frivolous society a vigorous impulse which turned it back to natural feelings; in his *Nouvelle Héloise* he opened its eyes to real nature and to true passions; he created poetry which has lived.

The political influence of these three men can be traced in the three great epochs of the Revolution. That of Voltaire appears in the universal enthusiasm of 1789; that of Montesquieu in the constitution-making of the National Assembly; that of Rousseau in the ideas, if not in the bloody acts, of the fierce dreamers of the Convention.

Near these great writers, in another and less disturbed atmosphere, but still in a lofty sphere, is to be found Buffon, a serene

and majestic mind, like that nature which he has painted so inimitably.

Of a lower rank were Diderot, a prolific and unequal writer; d'Alembert, a great mathematician attempting to organise the army of philosophers. These two men founded the *Encyclopædia*, the first volume of which appeared in 1751, a vast review of all human knowledge, everything being set forth in a new light, often threatening for the social order and always hostile to religion. Some famous debaters went still further; Helvetius in his work *L'Esprit;* Baron Holbach in his *Système de la Nature;* Lamettrie in his *Homme Machine;* the Abbé Raynal in his *Histoire philosophique des deux Indes.*

The Chancellor d'Aguesseau occupies a place apart; his great reforms composed the code of Louis XV. A place apart too must be given to the moralist Vauvernagues, who wrote the line, "Great thoughts come from the heart"; to Abbé de Condillac, a powerful analyst; to his brother, Abbé de Mably, a bold publicist; and to the Marquis de Condorcet, who, afterwards condemned with the Girondins, composed as he awaited death his *Esquisse de Progrès de l'Esprit humain.*

The Economists.—The philosophers attacked everything; the economists claimed only to deal with material things. In the seventeenth century it was held that a nation could only be rich if it bought little and sold much. Quesnay showed that the precious metals are a sign of wealth and not wealth itself, and found actual wealth in agriculture. Gournay held that wealth lay in industry. The theory of Adam Smith, who lived long in France, was more general; to him wealth lay in labour, and labour could be applied in three ways, agriculture, industry, and commerce. His pupils recognised a fourth way, intellectual labour, in the arts, literature, and science.

Thus human thought, which had long been confined to purely metaphysical speculation, or limited to the abstract cult of the muses, now claimed to deal with the most difficult problems which confronted human society. All, economists and philosophers alike, found in liberty the solution for the problems of the world. The school of Quesnay had a famous maxim, *Laissez faire, laissez passer,* which was applied for a time in the edicts of 1754 and 1764, edicts which allowed free trade in grain, and were to be proclaimed again by Turgot at a later date. D'Argenson had said the same thing in other words, *Pas trop gouverner.*

Arts.—There were two sides to the literature of the period, one serious, one frivolous. The arts were only frivolous. Exclu-

sive attention being paid to the search for beauty led to forgetfulness of the beauty of lines and types. Charming works were produced; the houses of the rich were decorated with spirit and coquettish elegance. But no great statue, no great painting resulted. As Versailles was deserted for the life of the boudoir, architects reduced their plans to the modest requirements of a society which had no longer the grand manner of the previous age.

Sciences.—The more austere sciences paved the way for their accession and empire by beginning, in regard to the physical world, that vast work of investigation which literature had undertaken in the political and moral sphere. But the great discoveries and the great men, except Buffon, do not belong to the reign of Louis XV. Reaumur, who invented the thermometer which bears his name; Clairaut and d'Alembert, who developed mathematical analysis; the botanists Adanson and Bernard de Jussieu; La Caille, who went to the Cape of Good Hope in 1750 to make a map of the southern sky; Bouguer and La Condamine, who travelled in 1736 in the tropics, while Clairaut and Maupertuis travelled in the arctic regions, to determine the measure of the degree and the shape of the earth, all belong to this period. The Piedmontese Lagrange, born of French parents, was retained at Berlin by the favours of Frederic II., and Lavoisier had not yet mastered the ideas which were to revolutionise chemistry.

Increasing Power and Demands of Public Opinion.—All this intellectual activity resulted in the creation in France of a new power, public opinion, and the government began to feel its influence. The nation, for some time the indifferent spectator of all these efforts, began to take an interest in them, began to think of reforms and to demand change. There was a desire that the administration should no longer be a fearful labyrinth in which the ablest were lost; that the public finances should no longer be plundered; that all should be secure in their persons and property; that the criminal code should be less bloodthirsty and the civil code more equitable. Religious toleration was demanded in place of dogma imposed by fear of death; it was asked that law should be founded on the principles of natural right and reason, not on arbitrary will or the inequality and confusion of 384 provincial customs; that there should be unity of weights and measures instead of the most extreme disorder; that taxes should be paid by all instead of poverty being taxed while wealth was left free; that labour should be delivered from servitude and that there should be freedom in

choice of occupation instead of the monopoly of corporations; that public offices should be open to all instead of being confined to those privileged by wealth or birth; and that there should be a lively interest in the welfare of the many, instead of indifference. In a word, the demand was that there should be equality before the law and that liberty should be regulated by right. These demands were so vigorous and so general that the need of reform was realised by all who were clear-sighted. No more tremendous movement has had more prophets to sound the alarm. Catinat, Vauban, St. Simon, and even Leibnitz were alarmed as to the future while Louis XIV. yet lived. As early as 1707, a magistrate, Bois-Guillebert, said, "A trial is approaching between those who pay and those who have only to receive." In 1710 Fénelon said, "The machinery of state is old and goes on with the impulse once given to it; it will collapse at the first shock." The only woman who ever roused Louis XV. from his torpor, the Duchess of Chateauroux, foresaw a great upheaval if no remedies were applied. At home and abroad there was the same feeling; Lord Chesterfield and the philosopher Kant were agreed. "All the signs that I have ever found in history as portending great revolutions are to be found in France to-day and become constantly more apparent," said Chesterfield. "Before the close of the century, half the power of the king and the priesthood will have been destroyed."

As the century advanced and as national shame increased, as Rosbach was followed by the *Parc-au-Cerfs* and the *Pacte de famine*, voices, at first satirical, later severe and terrible, were heard. The reign which began with the *Lettres persanes* ended with the *Contrat social*. Some hoped, others feared. Rousseau was consulted in 1761 by a councillor of the parliament of Paris on the choice of a refuge in Switzerland, he said, "The letter did not greatly surprise me since with him and many others I foresee that the decline of the constitution in France threatens an approaching collapse of the social order." Two years later, the parliament of Rouen said to the king himself, "Evils are at their height and foretell a most terrible future." Voltaire wrote (April 2, 1764) to the Marquis de Chauvelin, "All that I see around me sows the seeds of a revolution which will infallibly arrive and which I shall not have the pleasure of beholding. The French advance slowly, but they will arrive in the end. Light is so spread from one to another that at the first opportunity it will blaze out and then there will be a fine noise. The young men are fortunate; they will see these fine things."

The fine things were unfortunately mingled with terrible catastrophes which might have been prevented if the wishes of the people had been met sooner. In the second half of the century all enlightened governments, roused by French ideas, saw the need of effecting numerous reforms. Kings and ministers set to work: Pombal in Portugal; Ferdinand IV., Charles III., and Aranda in Spain; Tanucci in Naples; the Grand Duke Leopold in Tuscany; Joseph II. in Austria; Frederic II. in Prussia, reformed the laws, destroyed privileges and abuses, and exacted from the nobles and clergy important sacrifices, while increasing their own power. They dug canals, increased the number of roads, encouraged industry, commerce, and agriculture; they sought, and sometimes successfully, to increase the wealth of their subjects and the well-being of their states in order to augment their own wealth. Everywhere the talk was of justice, toleration, and philanthropy, though diplomacy was still able to have recourse to the most Machiavellian methods. In a word, governments effected reforms though without reforming themselves. The Landgraf of Hesse-Cassel wrote an excellent moral treatise, *Pensées divers sur les Princes;* he sent it to Voltaire and received from the prince of philosophers the most gracious praise, and at the same time sold to England 12,000 of his subjects. In France also, in the first part of the reign of Louis XVI., there were attempts at reform, and it was only after their failure that the Revolution broke out.

CHAPTER LVIII

REIGN OF LOUIS XVI. TO THE REVOLUTION (1775–1789)

Louis XVI.—The new king, grandson of Louis XV., was only twenty years old. He was a prince of pure mind and virtuous habits but of little spirit. He showed great timidity in character and speech; he was full of good intentions, but was unhappily too weak to be able to impose his will on those around him. While he was still the dauphin he said one day to a countess who reproached him for his serious manner in the midst of the frivolity of his grandfather's court, "I wish to be called Louis the Serious." And history, in looking for a surname for him, has found none more suitable than that which she also gave to the successor of Charlemagne.

Louis remitted the tax of the *joyeux avènement;* he reformed

the law which governed the *taille;* and to make his first act a popular one he recalled the parliament. If he showed his weakness in calling back to the ministry the old and futile Maurepas, he showed his love of equity by dismissing Maupeou and Terray, whom he replaced by Malesherbes and Turgot. He made another honest man, the Count of St. Germain, his minister of war; the latter wished to reorganise the finances and the administration, but attempting too many things at once, his good ideas were badly carried out and were only prejudicial to the general cause of reform.

Malesherbes and Turgot (1774–1776).—Lamoignon de Malesherbes, one of the greatest forces for good in the eighteenth century, had been since 1750 president of the court of *aides* and director of the library. At the court of *aides* he never lost an opportunity of reminding the government that the welfare of the country demanded economical administration. As director of the library he favoured the spirit of reform and innovation with which literature was then animated. This gained him an immense popularity among men of letters, but the king soon called him to the office of minister of the royal household, a post which carried with it the responsibility for the police of the kingdom. From the beginning of 1771 he had demanded the convocation of the States-General; many years later, in 1787, he secured for the Protestants the return to their rightful status in civil life.

Turgot, a man of superior mind, had both virtue and science. He was one of those who regarded liberty as a mirror of public morality and at the same time a source of wealth, being a mobile power for work. He was *Intendant* of Limoges from 1761; while there he suppressed the *corvées,* made roads, and popularised the use of the potato. By wise and generous measures, such as the institution of charitable bureaux, the free sale of grain, and the sacrifice of his private fortune, he kept this poor province from experiencing the scourge of famine. From his entry into the ministry (July 20, 1774) he dissented from the disastrous advice which unscrupulous men were giving the king; his advice to the king was, "No bankruptcy, no augmentation of taxes, no loans." Without having recourse to these usual methods, he found means in a year and a half to wipe off more than 100 millions of debt. To help and enlighten the government he wished to appoint from among the rural and urban proprietors municipalities charged with the assessment of taxes; the superintendence of public works; the care of the poor; and

the bringing before ministers of the ideas and wishes of the people on all local questions. Below these communal municipalities and drawn from them by election, he wished to form smaller public bodies; later on, when the nation had become accustomed to administer its own affairs in a small way, he would have created municipalities of provinces, and finally a municipality of the whole kingdom.

These were great innovations and Turgot projected others even more revolutionary; the abolition of the *corvées* which weighed heavily on the poor; the establishment of a territorial tax for the nobility and clergy, with rebatement to those curés and vicars who had only small salaries, and suppression with regard to monasteries; the equal distribution of the tax by the compilation of a register of lands; liberty of conscience and the recall of the Protestants; redemption of feudal rents; one law, one system of weights and measures for the whole kingdom; suppression of *jurandes* and *maitrises* (wardens and masters, government officials who hampered industry); free thought as well as free commerce and industry; in fact—as Turgot occupied himself with moral as well as material needs—a vast plan of public instruction which was to shed new light over the whole nation.

Reforms of Turgot: Opposition of the Privileged Classes.—These reforms were nothing less than a revolution. The interests they menaced made violent attacks on the minister; he could only proceed slowly and gradually. He did first what was most necessary. At that time grain was not allowed to be sent out of the province in which it had been harvested, even in the interior of a province where commerce had many difficulties to contend with. Turgot did away with these disastrous monopolies by authorising the free circulation of grain and flour throughout the kingdom. His enemies hastened to say that even exportation would be permitted, some even said it was already taking place. The people were troubled by the idea of their grain being sent abroad; they were made to fear famine, and that is the surest means of causing it. Risings took place in the country districts; troops of brigands—who, it was suspected, were paid to make trouble, though it was not known by whom—dared to show themselves even at Versailles, and robbed the bakers' shops in Paris (May, 1775).

A more violent agitation against Turgot took place when he suggested to the king the substitution for the *corvées* of a tax to be paid by the proprietors. The measure came before the

magistrates; private interests made them forget justice, and the parliament—which had often spoken of the welfare of the people—began a struggle, in defence of an obvious abuse, against Turgot, the minister who was first of all a reformer. The measure was only registered in a *lit-de-justice* and then only after it had been asserted that "the people are liable to the *taille* and the *corvées* at pleasure; that is a part of the constitution which the king is powerless to alter." The nobles said, "If the king were able to force us to contribute to the *corvées* he would also be able to enforce it in kind and make us work on the roads."[1] And the king said, "I know well that only M. Turgot and myself have the welfare of the people at heart." (March, 1776.) The giving of liberty to industry, as Turgot had already wished to give it to commerce, added still more to the number of his enemies.

Weakness of the King.—Maurepas, the chief minister, secretly undermined Turgot's credit with the king; the queen attacked the controller-general, who would talk of nothing but economy; Louis XVI., in spite of excellent intentions, began to grow tired of the experiments to which Turgot gave himself; Louis left these utopian dreams to think out vast designs of his own which were impossible to carry out. One day when Turgot came to consult him, Louis said, "Look what I am working at." He was composing a memorandum about the destruction of rabbits in the neighbouring countryside. At other times he would be interested in the trade of locksmiths; in drawing maps; or he would leave everything for a long day's hunting. Such were the occupations of the King of France—France on the brink of the Revolution! When the Emperor Joseph II. went to France in 1777 to study closely, and not without secret envy, her industries and arts, he learned with surprise that his brother-in-law, far from having visited his towns and provinces, had never even seen the *Invalides* or the Military School. Henry IV. was the bravest soldier in his own army; his son also was a good fighter. Louis XIV. and Louis XV. took their part in the battles of France. Their successor was unknown in the army. The monarchy had little by little retired from national life to grow weary in the solemn idleness of Versailles. The phenomenon which had already three times constituted the history of France, under the last of the Valois, under the *rois fainéants* who had allowed the crown of Clovis, of Charlemagne, and of St. Louis to fall from their heads, now appeared again. The royal race wore

[1] The *corvées* were originally exactions of statute labour.

itself out in the atmosphere of the court just as great trees, whose sap begins to run dry, fade away and die miserably.

Dismissal of Turgot (1776): Suppression of his Reforms.—Malesherbes, the upright friend and colleague of Turgot, was like him pursued by the anger of the privileged classes; he fell first; he was given his dismissal. Turgot, made of stronger stuff, waited for his; he would never have forsaken the post in which he knew he could do good had he not been driven away from it. On the 12th of May, 1776, he was commanded to leave the ministry. He wrote to the king, "I wish only that you may always be able to think I have been wrong; that what I have shown you were only chimerical dangers. I hope that my forebodings may not be justified and that your reign may be as happy, as peaceful as your people have reason to expect from your principles of justice and beneficence." Only those who had looked far ahead and who saw the revolution coming mourned the fall of Turgot. Voltaire addressed to him his *Épître à un Homme* and André Chénier praised him in his *Hymne à la France*.

Barely four months had passed before the king granted to the privileged classes the re-establishment of the *corvées* and the *maitrises*. Turgot and Malesherbes were succeeded by nonentities, Amelot, Clugny, Taboureau des Réaux. Maurepas, now a frivolous old man in his seventy-sixth year, who governed by epigrams, dreaded those who disturbed his peace of mind by showing him the ever-widening abyss in front of the nation. "At least no one can accuse me," he said, on calling Amelot to the ministry, "of choosing this man for his spirit."

Necker (1776-1781).—The American War was about to begin. An ordinance of June 10th, 1776, ordered the arming of twenty ships of the line. In order to meet the new expenses, with already a large deficit in the Budget, an able man was needed. Recourse was had to Necker, a banker of Geneva, who had a great reputation as a financier. His banking transactions had already been considerable under Louis XV.; and he had more than once received from the controller-general letters conceived in the style of a debtor in his last extremity. "We implore you to help us. We remember your affection for the reputation of the treasury." Necker was called to the administration of the treasury, the deplorable state of which had been revealed to him. As he was a Protestant and a foreigner, he was only given the title of Director of Finance (October, 1776). He had neither the greatness nor the force of Turgot, though he also proposed the institution of provincial assemblies in the cause of financial

administration: he had not the great political conceptions of Turgot. In some ways Necker lacked initiative and settled opinions; he thought the evil which was destroying France might be fought by expedients and partial reforms. He was animated by the most generous feelings; he worked solely for the good of the people and hoped in that way to make a name for himself. For five years he supported with honour a position rendered difficult by the mean and jealous character of Maurepas, the indolence of the king, and the greed of the courtiers. He had to deal with the deficit which Turgot had neither the time nor the means to wipe out; to provide for the expenses of the American War and for the enormous expenses of a court encumbered with officials and servants of every imaginable description. He succeeded without adding to the taxes, without stringent economies in the court; but by a reduction in the cost of the collection of the taxes and by a thousand small reforms; by a loan of 490 millions which was raised for the most part by the sale of annuities. It was all very well to call it public credit, but borrowing entails a heavy burden, it was merely delaying the problem, not solving it; and under this honest administration of an able banker, who was not however a great minister, the danger which threatened France continued to grow. Necker, to complete the misfortune, counted on peace in the future—and who may foretell the future?

Necker fell two years before the Revolution. The occasion of his downfall was his famous *Compte rendu de l'état des finances*, published in 1781, a statement which created a great stir; it was incomplete, because he only showed the income and expenditure of normal times. It did not mention the loans nor the expenses of the war. The income appeared to be 10 million more than the expenditure. The public was delighted with what met its eyes; it did not know that it saw only the veil which hid the real state of the finances: Necker's publication was received with great applause. The capitalists demanded 236 millions from the minister. But the court was annoyed by this appeal to the public. If daylight was allowed to enter into the financial administration what would become of the innumerable pensions; of the habitual plunder and pillage that went on there? Maurepas gave the signal for the attack. The *Compte rendu* had appeared in a blue cover: "Have you read the blue fairy tale?" he asked every one; the saying took the public fancy and the hostility which had succeeded so well against Turgot recommenced against his successor. Parliament thought its political

rôle was threatened, and so it was, for Necker wished to confine it to judicial affairs : it fought against the edict for the establishment of provincial assemblies. The courtiers strove by evil-speaking to decry the minister who was ruining them by setting the financial affairs of the state in order, whose retrenchments reached even to their little perquisites and profits ; who suppressed the *coureurs de vin*, the *hâteurs de rôt*, the *galopins* of the royal household, and many other offices of this kind which the king gave to his gentlemen, who then sold them for a good price because the buyer saw a way to make a large profit out of them. Louis XVI. gave way to the clamours of his court, and when Necker, his patience exhausted, offered his resignation, the king accepted it (May 21, 1781). It was a real calamity for the people ; nothing was spoken of but Necker's retreat ; the theatres were full of allusions to his downfall ; the great nobles went to see him in his house at St. Ouen ; Joseph II. and the Empress of Russia wrote to him. Besides his financial reforms several great ideas had marked his administration ; he had enfranchised the serfs of the royal domains ; destroyed the *droit de suite*, which gave to the overlord all property acquired by his fugitive serf in a foreign country ; he abolished the *question préparatoire*. Some of the nobles who still possessed serfs followed the king's example and enfranchised them : the chapter of St. Cloud exacted an indemnity of 25,000 écus (an écu was generally six francs) for enfranchising the serfs belonging to it.

The American War (1778–1783) : La Fayette.—The Seven Years' War, so favourable politically to England, had none the less ruined her finances and given her a national debt of 2½ milliards,[1] which represented an annual interest of 88 million francs. The mother-country thought she would spread part of this heavy burden over the colonies. She put a tax on stamps, on glass, on paper, and on tea. Public feeling forced her to abandon these taxes : she only kept the last. But the people of Boston, invoking the great principle of the English constitution that no tax must be levied unless it has been voted by the representatives of the people, threw overboard a cargo of tea which had come from London rather than pay the duty. War broke out (1775). Insurrection spread over all the provinces : the following year their deputies reunited in a general congress at Philadelphia, published the Declaration of Independence which embodied the following principles ; they seem almost to emanate from the soul and the philosophy of France : " All men are created equal : they

[1] A milliard is a thousand millions. The word is now rarely used.

are given certain unalterable rights by the Creator: to assure themselves of the enjoyment of these rights men have established governments, whose authority emanates from those governed: whenever any form of agreement whatsoever becomes destructive of the aims for which it was established the people have the right to change or abolish it."

France hailed with enthusiasm a revolution in which she recognised her own influence. During their stay in Paris the three American deputies, Arthur Lee, Silas Deane, and above all the aged Franklin, so celebrated already as a doctor, received perpetual ovations. The young nobility, uplifted by their philosophical ideas and anxious to wipe out the shame of the Seven Years' War by fighting their hated rival, demanded that they should be allowed to set out in force for America. The Marquis de la Fayette, already nearly eighty years old, left his young wife and chartered a ship which he armed and in which he would have set sail for America, but the government feared a break with England. Turgot had insisted that France should remain neutral, foreseeing that England would gain more by recognising the independence of her colonies than by holding them beneath the yoke. De Vergennes contented himself with sending help indirectly in the form of arms, money, and munitions, which Beaumarchais undertook to convey. Louis XVI. had no taste for war; above all he did not wish to be the aggressor and perhaps he made to himself in his heart the same arguments as those which an English pamphlet addressed to him. "You arm, imprudent king! You arm to uphold the independence of America and the rulings of Congress. But there is a power which is rising in our day, below the laws: it is that of ambition and reason: it is now conducting a revolution in America; perhaps it is preparing one in France. The legislators of America declare themselves disciples of the philosophy of France: they carry out what France has dreamed of. Do the French philosophers not aspire to be legislators in their own country? . . . Would it not be a great danger to put the flower of your officers in touch with these enthusiasts of liberty? You will be uneasy—too late—when you hear in your court the vague and plausible axioms which were thought out and formulated in the backwoods of America. After shedding their blood for a cause which they call that of liberty, how will your subjects respect your dictatorial commands? Where do you hope to find security when the statue of the King of England is broken to pieces in America, when the people devote themselves to insult-

ing his name ? England will terribly revenge your hostile designs, your government will be examined, judged, and condemned after the principles proposed at Philadelphia, principles which are applauded in your capital!" These were prophetic words. But Louis XVI. allowed himself to be misled, and on the 6th of February he signed a treaty of commerce corroborating an offensive and defensive alliance with America if England declared war on France. The English ambassador was at once recalled.

D'Orvilliers, d'Estaing, and Guichen.—It was fortunate for France that Choiseul had reorganised her navy. A fleet of twelve ships of the line and four frigates left Toulon for America (1778) under Count d'Estaing. Another fleet was assembled at Brest to fight in European waters ; and an army prepared to make an attack on England. The fight of the frigate *La Belle-Poule*, which dismasted an English frigate, made a glorious opening to the hostilities ; and the Count d'Orvilliers, who sailed from Brest with thirty-two ships, decided the supremacy of the two fleets in the Battle of Ouessant, fought against Admiral Keppel (July 27). Not to have obtained the victory was for England to have been beaten. Count d'Estaing was able to carry the day in a brilliant success against Admiral Howe who was in inferior force ; but his fleet was scattered by a storm and he intentionally ran aground in an attempt on St. Lucia, of which the English had taken possession, while Bouille took Domingo.

The fruits of Choiseul's policy were reaped in this way. He had renewed the alliance between France and Spain ; Spain had offered its mediation, which England had refused. Urged by the Count of Vergennes, who suggested the reconquering of Gibraltar, Minorca, and the Floridas, Spain declared war on England and allied her fleet to that of France (1779). Count d'Orvilliers with sixty-six ships of the line laid his course for Plymouth : a storm scattered his fleet and saved England from disaster. France consoled herself for having lost the fruit of this great effort by the capture of Grenada by d'Estaing, who was the first to seize on the enemy entrenchments. This event made a considerable stir in Paris. Admiral Rodney found himself detained on account of debts which he could not meet. One day when he dined with the Marshal de Biron, he treated the success of the French navy with disdain, saying that if he were at liberty he would justify his opinions. The marshal shortly afterwards paid Rodney's debts : "Go, sir," he said, "go and try to make good your promises : the French will not take advantage of obstacles which prevent your fulfilling them."

This chivalrous generosity cost France dear. Rodney vanquished five Spanish men-of-war off Cape St. Vincent, relieved Gibraltar, where he revictualled his ships, and engaged in three battles with the French fleet under Count de Guichen off the Antilles. But Guichen held the victory to be indecisive and took in his turn an English convoy of sixty vessels, with spoil valued at 50 millions.

Armed Neutrality.—A check received by Count d'Estaing before Savannah compromised the American cause for a short time. But a vast coalition was formed against the maritime despotism of England. To prevent France and Spain from receiving the necessary naval munitions from the north, the English stopped and searched all neutral vessels. That gave rise to vexations and abuses, and interfered with the commerce of neutral countries. Catherine II. proclaimed (August, 1780) the "privilege of the flags," on the condition that they did not shelter contraband of war, powder, bullets, cannon, and such like; to uphold this principle she proposed an armed neutrality which was accepted successively by Sweden, Denmark, Prussia, Austria, Portugal, the Two Sicilies, and Holland. England, highly incensed, declared war on Holland, the weakest and most vulnerable of the neutral powers. Rodney descended on St. Eustatius, one of the Dutch colonies of the Antilles, where he took booty to the value of 16 millions: the brave Lamothe-Piquet, however, captured it from him when he was already within sight of the English coast.

Success of the Count de Grasse and the Bailiff of Suffren.—The year 1781 was the most successful for France in this war. The Count de Grasse had a series of brilliant victories. "He stands six foot high," one of his marines said, "and six foot one inch on the day of battle." His victories contributed to those which Washington, Rochambeau, and La Fayette won in America. On the 11th of October, 1781, they forced General Cornwallis to capitulate in Yorktown with 7000 men, 6 men-of-war, and 50 merchant vessels. This feat of arms was decisive for American independence. The English, who still occupied New York, Savannah, and Charleston, could do nothing but defend themselves. At the same time the Marquis de Bouille retook St. Eustatius; the Duke de Crillon took Minorca, and Suffren, one of the greatest naval heroes of France, won four great victories (February to September, 1782). He and Haider-Ali, the Sultan of Mysore, had great plans for the destruction of the English domination in that continent; but peace put an end to their designs.

Battle of Saintes.—In the Antilles the English kept no important island except Jamaica; and De Grasse tried to take it from them in 1782. Attacked by superior forces under Rodney, he was defeated and taken prisoner; on board his ship there were only three men left unwounded. The Battle of Saintes had great influence on public opinion. It seemed to be forgotten that this was the first battle France had lost in this war.

Siege of Gibraltar.—The able defence of Gibraltar against the combined forces of France and Spain was another check. This siege had given rise to universal hope in France. The Count of Artois, brother of Louis XVI., had obtained the king's permission to fight. Twenty thousand men and forty ships blockaded the place, 200 cannon on land and 10 batteries afloat opened a tremendous fire against the rock on the 12th of September. It was defended by its impregnable position and the courage of Eliot, the English governor. Attacked with a ferocity never before equalled, Gibraltar soon found itself in a desperate situation. It had launched in vain 600 red-hot cannon balls against the floating batteries, till at last one of them struck the *Tailla Pedra*, and burned its way through the ship to the powder magazine, which exploded with terrific force. The fire spread to the two neighbouring batteries, and the Spaniards, in order that the English might not gain possession of the others, set them also on fire. Twelve thousand men perished in this siege and Gibraltar remained with the English.

Treaty of Versailles (1783).—But England had lost the fame of invincibility at sea, suffered heavily in her commerce, and added 2½ milliards of francs to the national debt. Lord North, the head of the war party, left the ministry and was replaced by Whigs (1782) who sent peace proposals to Versailles. France, on her side, had spent 1400 millions; but she had obtained a great and noble result: the Independence of the United States. Peace was signed on the 3rd of September, 1783. It was an honourable peace for France, it annulled the infamous article of the Treaty of Utrecht regarding Dunkirk; it gave Minorca to Spain, and obtained for France the restitution of Chandernagore, Pondicherry, Karikal, Mahé, and Surat in India; Tobago and St. Lucia in the Antilles; the little islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon with the right of fishing at Terra Novo; Gorée and Senegal in Africa. This was the last triumph of the old monarchy. "What an empire!" cried Joseph II. on seeing a French fleet set sail from Brest, "What an empire! The earth and the sea!"

Within two years the Treaty of Versailles announced a com-

mercial treaty between France and England. It was signed in 1786 and substituted for the existing prohibition a duty proportional to the value of the goods common to the merchandise of both countries. This treaty was the first step taken by England towards a new commercial policy, a policy which put liberty in the place of prohibition. Another treaty with Russia in 1787 opened to France a country which had hitherto been exploited by the Dutch and English alone.

France at this time held out a helping hand to a small people to help them to rise to the rank of a nation. Her subsidies to Sweden, her intention, openly declared, of supporting Gustave III., had acted as a curb to the shameless ambition of Prussia and Russia. France had also helped to deliver Bavaria, the country where the two German powers met to fight, from the attacks of Austria, by compelling Austria and Prussia to accept the mediation of France and Russia (Treaty of Teschen, 1779). The diplomacy of France was thus as successful as her arms.

Progress of Science.—The forward movement which had prevailed in this century continued its course and swept the arts along with it. Greuze, by the simple and gracious *naïveté* of his art, and Vien, the master of David, reigned supreme in painting; Grétry and Rameau in music. There were remarkable public works: canals between the Seine and the Saône and between the Saône and the Loire; the great dyke at Cherbourg, one of the greatest works ever accomplished by man—all these enterprises were commenced. The great minds of the age were full of serious enthusiasm. Sciences were created and became more generally studied. Lavoisier succeeded in decomposing water and by this one act transformed chemistry and with it modern industry. (*Théorie de la Calcination des Métaux*, 1775.) The Abbé of Épée founded his institution for deaf-mutes in 1778; Valentin Haüy his for the blind in 1784; Pinet affirmed that those mentally deranged were not necessarily dangerous, that they did not always need to be locked up, but might in some cases be cured. Turgot established a chair of hydrodynamics to foster the knowledge required for the great hydraulic enterprises he meditated. In 1778 a chair of mineralogy was founded; Abbé Haüy founded the Royal Society of Medicine; the Veterinary College of Alfont was begun in 1780; the School of Mines in 1788; the Academy of Sciences was enriched in 1787 by the foundation of special sections dealing with natural history, agriculture, mineralogy, and physical science, which thus brought the sciences for the first time within the reach of the

public. Seven years earlier an Englishman, Edward Jenner, had discovered a vaccine against smallpox, a scourge which ravaged humanity; agriculture saw two great advances, the introduction of maize into France and the beginning of the silk-worm industry; Parmentier added to the foodstuffs of the country by popularising the use of the potato[1] (1779). Daubenton introduced into France that Spanish breed of sheep known as merinos. Two years later the Marquis of Jeffroy made the first attempt at steam navigation, an attempt which had unfortunately no results. But Galvani of Bologna proved in 1791 the curious electrical phenomena called by his name, galvanism; Volta of Como invented the electric pile, which opened up new paths to chemistry. Finally, in the same year which saw the reunion of the States-General, Laurent de Jussien determined for purposes of botanical classification the *subordination of characters* which as afterwards worked out by Cuvier gave new life to the natural sciences.

At the same time bold and learned navigators, the English Wallis and Cook, the French Bougainville and La Pérouse, completed the work of Christopher Columbus and Vasco da Gama by achieving the survey of the whole globe, and in the face of many dangers and at the hazard of their own lives discovering and making known the great trade routes. Thus were the natural sciences applied to useful ends, while the moral sciences tended to political reform. This involuntary accord announced the approach of a new era.

Death of Voltaire and Rousseau.—The press became more active and more daring. One of Turgot's friends wrote a work on the *inconveniences of feudal law* which the parliament ordered to be burned: the first number of the *Journal de Paris*—a daily paper to satisfy the restless curiosity of the public—appeared on January 1, 1777. The greatest homage was paid to those great men who led the thought of the time. Voltaire, who was at that time eighty-four years old, came to Paris and lived in the house of the Marquis de Villette at the corner of the Rue de Beaune and the Quai des Théatins, now called the Quai Voltaire. His salons were thronged with an immense crowd which even extended to the space beneath his windows. Franklin took his

[1] The potato, which was brought from Peru in the sixteenth century, was thought to infect those who ate it with fevers and even with leprosy. Parmentier had it analysed in 1778 and obtained leave to sow thirty-four acres of the plain of Sablons, up till then a barren waste. People thought him mad, but the plant grew, the flowers appeared; he made a bouquet of them which he presented to Louis XVI., who put one of the flowers in his buttonhole. The cause of the potato was won.

little grandson to receive Voltaire's blessing; the patriarchal De Ferney [1] put his hand on the child's head: "God and liberty," he said, "that is the only suitable benediction for a grandchild of Franklin." He went to the Académie française who assembled to receive him, an honour which was not accorded even to kings. He went to the Comédie française where—as a contemporary writer puts it—"France took him in her arms." When he appeared in the box the whole house rose and broke into applause. Voltaire, leaning forward, cried: "Fellow-countrymen, you will make me die of pleasure." A crown was put on his head; he at once sent it to Madame Villette, but the Prince of Beauveau replaced it on the head of Voltaire. The play was about to begin: it was the first night of *Irène*. When it was over the curtain rose again; the bust of Voltaire was seen in the centre of the stage, surrounded by the actors. The bust was covered with flowers and remained on the stage during the next piece, which was also by Voltaire, *Nanine*, one of his best comedies. He only survived these triumphs by two months: he died on the 30th May, 1778: his body was laid in the Abbey of Sellières, but was afterwards removed in 1791 to the Pantheon.

Rousseau, his rival in fame and influence, soon followed him (July 3). He died alone, as he had lived, in the quiet retreat which the Marquis de Girardin had begged him to accept at Ermenonville. His modest tomb rests on a little island surrounded by poplars, which has become a place of pilgrimage for the admirers of his genius. Montesquieu had died in 1755. Of the four great writers of the century Buffon alone survived; he did not pass away till 1788 at the age of eighty-one years; he was still to give the world a fine work in his *Époques de la Nature* (1778), a book which was very popular at that time. Far below Voltaire and Rousseau, but inheriting something of their spirit, were Beaumarchais, the writer of the *Mariage de Figaro* (1784), a work which carried on the fight against inborn prejudices; and Bernardin de St. Pierre, who in his *Études* in 1784 and above all in his *Paul et Virginie* tried to revive love of nature, of simplicity, and true sentiment.

Discovery of Air-Balloons (1783).—The ardent pursuit of knowledge, the constant opening up of new paths was so great that it seemed as if there were no limits to the horizon of science. Franklin "tore the thunder from the clouds"; Pilatre de Rozier and the Marquis d'Arlandes at the castle of La Muette

[1] The château of Ferney was for a time the home of Voltaire, who was therefore sometimes called by this name.

made the first ascent in a balloon invented by Montgolfier. Man, already master of land and sea, proceeded also to take possession of the air, that air which Lavoisier had recently decomposed by the oxydation of mercury into distinct gases. The brothers Charles and Robert Montgolfier repeated their aërostatic performance at the Tuileries in a gas-balloon before a vast crowd of spectators: two years later Blanchard crossed in a balloon from Dover to Calais, but Pilatre de Rozier and Romain, who set out to make the same journey on a new plan, were dashed to pieces on the rocks of the coast.

Magnetism.—Cagliostro and Mesmer, who practised the mysterious illusions of magnetism, appeared at the same time as the aërostats. Cagliostro was an Italian adventurer who liked to be thought a count. He lived in luxury and pretended to hold the real secret of chemistry, such as had been discovered by the priests of Egypt and India. Mesmer—also an adventurer—was a German, who, having been ejected from Vienna, came to Paris to give his famous *séances* (1779). In a gorgeous room filled with heavy perfumes, dimly lighted, and pervaded by soft dreamy music, calculated to work on the imagination and the senses, invalids and those interested in such matters assembled round the *baquet magnétique;* some of the audience soon fell into convulsions and the complaint spread to others in the crowd. Magnetism was regarded as the remedy for all evils. "There is only one nature," said Mesmer, "one illness, one cure." A committee of the Academy of Sciences was appointed by the government; it consisted of Lavoisier, Franklin, and Bailly, who were entrusted with the examination of magnetic experiences; the commission reported that those who dealt in magnetism did obtain curious results, not by means of a fluid as they asserted, but by the over-excitation of the imagination. Éprémesnil, a famous magistrate, took up the defence of Cagliostro and Mesmer.

Freemasons.—The freemasons worked in obscurity and silence below the politicians and scientists. They belonged to an old and vast association of men of every rank and country, who, in spite of rites that were both ridiculous and useless, nurtured and propagated liberal ideas.

The Queen Marie-Antoinette.—In the midst of all these marvels which spoke for the force of the nation, if sometimes also for its eccentricity, opinion came to be the dominating power in the world, and numbered the most respected powers on its side. In former times the court had set the tone and constituted the

rule of French society ; but Louis XVI. was not able to live up to the traditions of Louis XIV., and the beautiful and gracious Marie-Antoinette had made many enemies in the court by her favouritism and in public by her disregard and even disdain for the rules of royal etiquette. She left Versailles for Trianon, that the Queen of France might live for herself alone. That was the custom in the house of Austria, but not in the house of Bourbon. One evening, her carriage having broken down, she drove in a cab to a ball at the Opera ; the next day Paris rang with the story of this "imprudence." And then the slander began which later changed into anger and broke out in such a dreadful fashion against her who was now no longer called anything but "the Austrian." An unfortunate occurrence in 1784 showed the public feeling towards her. The Cardinal de Rohan was at that time the scandal of the Church. While ambassador at Vienna he had compromised his character as a priest and as the representative of France by light conduct and frightful extravagances. He said it was impossible for a gentleman to live on an income of 1,200,000 livres. His relative the Prince of Rohan-Guéméné was a bankrupt for 30 millions ; his downfall had ruined many people ; the cardinal was proud of it. "Only a king or a Rohan," he said, "could go bankrupt for such a sum." Despised by the king, condemned by the queen, he was in utter disgrace. The intriguing Countess of Lamotte led him to believe that she was the confidante of Marie-Antoinette and that the latter was disposed to honour him by her favour ; she supported these insinuations by letters purporting to come from the queen and forged in her handwriting. She went as far as to promise him an interview with the queen one evening in the gardens at Versailles. A young lady who resembled the queen played the rôle which the countess assigned to her, and the cardinal believed that nothing would now be refused to his ambition. Some time before this, two jewellers had offered to Marie-Antoinette a necklace worth 1,600,000 livres. She had refused to buy it, adding that, with the king, she thought two warships would be of more use to France than this bauble. The countess made the cardinal believe that the queen had a great desire for the necklace, and even that she charged him to buy it for her. He went to the jewellers, showed them the letters, was given the necklace, out of which the countess made a handsome profit for herself. Some time later, the jewellers became suspicious, never having been paid, and wrote to the queen. Everything was discovered. The cardinal was arrested at Versailles in his

pontifical robes, and sent to the Bastille. Parliament took up the affair, released the cardinal as a simple dupe, and condemned the countess to be branded and kept in close confinement. This affair made a great stir, and the queen, being a foreigner, her reputation suffered for having been mixed up in the scandal.

Louis XVI. had up till now treated her with coldness. Later on she came to have great ascendancy over him. It was after the resignation of Necker that she began to identify herself with the government. But not having the administrative genius of her mother, Maria Theresa, although she wanted influence, she did not want to be troubled with business, and as she only gave it spasmodic and distracted attention she could not exert her influence in any definite direction. But she was responsible for calling Calonne, in 1783, to the office of controller-general.

Calonne (1783–1787).—Calonne had knowledge of administration and great faculty for work, but he was a spendthrift. He was scarcely appointed when he went to the king, "Sire," he said, "I have 200,000 livres of debts; another man might have hidden this from you and taken the money from the funds of the ministry; I prefer to tell you." The king, astonished, went to his secretary and gave Calonne the sum in the form of shares of some company. Calonne kept the shares, his debts were paid otherwise. His financial principles were as follows: "A man who wishes to borrow must appear to be rich; to appear rich it is necessary to dazzle by lavish expenditure. Economy is doubly fatal; it warns the capitalists from lending to a treasury over the ears in debt; it causes arts to languish, which prodigality revives." It was an agreeable theory for those who had easy access to the treasury. The courtiers and the ladies were enchanted with this delightful minister, who did not, like Turgot and Necker, carry the serious and anxious expression of the conscientious exercise of great power, and who would meet a request from the queen with the obliging words, "If it is possible, Madame, it is done; if it is impossible, it shall be done." The king in his indolence was pleased with a minister who was never at a loss whatever might happen. But this pleasing exterior concealed 500 millions of loans in three years, and that in time of peace.

The moment was at hand when everything should be disclosed to the king. Then the spendthrift turned reformer. Calonne thought out a policy, composed of the ideas of his predecessors, namely, to submit the privileged classes to taxation and a territorial subvention; to establish provincial assemblies; to diminish

the *taille;* to allow free trade for all grainstuffs, and so on. "But that is Necker's idea you offer me," cried the king, "the whole idea is Necker's from beginning to end!" "Sire," replied Necker's enemy, "in the whole realm of things there is nothing better to offer you."

The Notables (1787).—The fatal words "privileges," "abuses," were heard everywhere. Government, finding no support in parliament, was obliged to have recourse to the nation for these reforms. But the government was afraid of the States-General: it did not dare to go further than to an assembly of notables. Many were even afraid of that; "The king will dismiss him," said the Vicomte de Ségur; and the old Marshal de Richelieu asked what penalty Louis XIV. had imposed on the minister who had proposed a similar course. The notables met on February 12, 1787. They numbered 144 members, of whom twenty-seven represented the third estate, though in reality there were only six or seven commoners. Calonne had worked out his plans which were on the whole well received. But the notables viewed the territorial subvention with disfavour. They demanded a statement of the income and expenditure of the nation. Calonne presented the accounts in such a way that it was impossible to verify his figures. Some declared there was a deficit of 200, others of only 100 millions. But they were less interested in obtaining a clear insight into the finance of the country than in evading the territorial subvention. The debate was heated and soon became violent. Calonne was angry; so was the king; he ordered the notables to deliberate on the *form* of the tax only, not on its existence. The situation was described in an allegorical pamphlet: a cook talking to his chickens, asked them, "What sauce would you like to be eaten with?" "But we do not wish to be eaten at all!" "You are begging the question: I ask you with what sauce would you like to be eaten?" Calonne's enemies achieved his downfall; a few days after Louis XVI. had declared loudly, "I wish all the world to know that I am well satisfied with my controller-general," he exiled Calonne to Lorraine.

Ministry of Brienne (1787–1788).—One of Calonne's most active enemies was Brienne, Archbishop of Toulouse, a brilliant and ambitious prelate, without manners and probably without beliefs, whom the pious Louis XVI. had long since driven from the ministry. He recalled him at length and Brienne won favour with the notables by his schemes for economy. That assembly did not wait to be dissolved; the nobles had had enough of it;

the Count of Artois was bored; the Duke of Orleans and the Prince of Conti went off to their hunting in the middle of its sittings. And so the notables had done nothing; in their hearts they had pronounced the words *States-General* or *National Assembly*. "A national assembly is a necessity," said La Fayette. "You mean the States-General," replied the Count of Artois. "Yes, my lord, and even something better if possible."

Brienne, freed from the notables, found himself face to face with parliament, which was even more difficult to approach. The edict concerning provincial assemblies was passed without difficulty, but a violent dispute arose over the proposed tax on timber and the territorial subvention. The king held a *lit-de-justice* and caused both measures to be passed. Parliament protested; its leaders were Duport, Robert de St. Vincent, Fréteau de St. Just, above all Éprémesnil, whose impassioned eloquence dominated the assembly, and whom the crowd on leaving the building carried in triumph to his carriage. The king exiled the parliament to Troyes. There were few men more unpopular than Brienne; but he was in good repute with the queen, to whom he owed not only his position but his reinstatement in the good graces of the king. The queen was already hotly attacked in certain pamphlets; she was called *Madame Deficit*. She was insulted in the park of St. Cloud, and at the request of the police the king engaged not to show himself in Paris. Brienne had not even the support of his own brethren. The Assembly of Clergy refused him a miserable subsidy of 1,800,000 livres. Everybody tried to put a spoke in his wheel, and when in three years the chariot broke down there was a universal demand for violence. He was no better liked abroad. In Holland he allowed the intrigues of England and the arms of Prussia to threaten the republican government of that country which stretched out its hand to France, saying the while that from the midst of internal disquiet it was dangerous to support external liberty. Brienne worked against the sentiment of the age.

But a reconciliation was effected between the government and the parliament. This partnership came at a time of general excitement: the effigy of Calonne was burned on the Place Dauphiné, and the audacity of the mob grew to such an extent that there was even talk of burning the effigy of a more august personage. Why was parliament so popular, the parliament which had defended the cause of the privileged classes? It was because it upheld the principle against the court that the States-General alone had the right to change the basis of taxation.

Brienne, who knew this, had won the majority of the members to his side. He carried a decree for a loan of 420 millions realisable in five years. He wished with one transaction to provide himself for a long time ahead, and not to have recourse to small loans. He promised in exchange the convocation of the States-General before the end of the five years; firmly resolved beforehand not to redeem his promise. There were energetic protests. "If a noble did such things," said Robert de St. Vincent, speaking of the usurious rates of the loan, "no tribunal would hesitate to annul them." Louis XVI. had a decree of authority passed: Sabatier and Fréteau, who had been violent in their protests, were arrested. The Duke of Orleans, who ventured to pronounce the word *illegal*, was exiled to Villers-Cotterets. "It *is* legal," said the king. "It is legal, because I wish it." Parliament was concerned at this attempt on its power; in the case of two members, an attempt on individual liberty. Éprémesnil composed, in the name of the parliament, an act which summed up the fundamental laws of the monarchy: a young councillor, Goislard de Montsabert, proposed putting an obstacle in the way of the collection of the *vingtième*: both these men were arrested by order of the king. Parliament was in session when the Marquis of Agout, major of the *Gardes françaises*, appeared and demanded that Éprémesnil and Montsabert should be handed over to him. The members rose in a body: "We are Éprémesnil and Montsabert," they cried. But the latter gave themselves up under protest and were sent, the one to Pierre-Encise, the other to the island of St. Margaret.

The government gained by this stroke; parliament was commanded to attend at Versailles on the 8th of May, and was forced to agree to decrees which took from it the power of passing laws. That power was transferred to a *cour plenière*, a sort of council of state, at the command of the king, which prescribed the institution of forty-seven large bailiwicks to judge civil lawsuits of less value than 20,000 livres. Thus Brienne engaged anew in the struggle—as Maupeou had done—with the power of the parliaments. Resistance was organised and movements took place in Brittany, in Béarn, and other provinces, as well as an insurrection at Grenoble. "I foresaw it all," said Brienne with an air of profound wisdom, "even civil war." He had only forgotten that the treasury was empty. To procure funds he took possession of the savings of invalids and the proceeds of charitable organisations. By these shameful means he was able to hold on for several days; but on the 16th of August, 1781,

he was obliged to declare by decree that state payments would be made partly in silver, partly in treasury notes. Consternation prevailed; the country feared that the advent of paper money was a forerunner of bankruptcy. It was the last straw for Brienne; he implored Necker for help; Necker replied, "Last year I was ready to take over part of his work: I do not want now to shoulder his discredit." But Brienne was forced to make way for that able minister, who was at the moment the most popular man in France.

Second Ministry of Necker (1787–1789).—Necker's return provoked acclamations of joy; the departure of Brienne was the signal for scenes of disorder, even of bloodshed; the mob burned his effigy and persisted with such obstinacy in the riot that soldiers were ordered to fire on the crowd. This first blood spilt in France made a great impression; parliament opened proceedings. But confidence returned, thanks to Necker. In one day government securities went up 30 per cent. But Necker had found only 500,000 livres in the treasury; the need was urgent and considerable. It was too late to save the country by small measures. Things could go on no longer without an appeal to the nation. Brienne in a moment of exasperation had thrown out the promise to convoke the States-General in 1789; Necker redeemed the promise.

Convocation of States-General.—The reunion of the states was the one thought of France. In what form should they be united? Should the third order have the same rank as in 1614, when it had been so deeply humiliated, or should it, on the contrary, be made the dominating power? During the last two centuries it had made great progress. It had come to exercise considerable power by its wealth, its knowledge, its activity, and the high functions which its leaders discharged in the government and administration of the country. Respect for the nobility had strangely diminished, and every one, even the nobles themselves, had applauded in the theatre the bold epigrams of *Figaro*, the play of Beaumarchais: "Because you are a great lord you think yourself a great genius! You have given the trouble of being born, nothing else!" That the third order might occupy the place it deserved, it was necessary to double the number of its representatives and to establish the individual instead of the communal vote. This policy was supported by Necker and by all liberal-minded men. But the nobility resisted; the nobles of Brittany especially were so obstinate that there were several bloody encounters at Rennes between the young *bourgeoisie*

and the nobles. Necker attempted to settle the dispute by an assembly of notables, but they resisted any change in the ancient order of things. He then decided to solve part of the difficulty himself and pronounced a decree which established the doubling of the representation, without mentioning the question of the individual vote. The decree also trysted the States-General to meet on the 1st of May, 1789.

FIFTEENTH PERIOD—CONSTITUTIONAL FRANCE

(From 1789)

CHAPTER LIX

THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF FRANCE (1789–1791)

The Necessity of a Constitution.—The ancient axiom of public law in France was that the commons paid in goods, the nobles in blood, the clergy in prayer. But the clergy of the court and of the *salons* were now little given to prayer, the nobles no longer formed the whole of the royal army, the commons alone remained faithful to their function in the state. They paid always and every year more. Seeing that the purse of the commons now formed the largest revenue of the treasury, it was inevitable that, as the monarchy became more and more extravagant, the more it put itself in the power of the commons; the time arrived when, left to meet the charges, the commons demanded to see the bill. The day of reckoning was the Revolution of 1789.

The Abbe Siéyès, in a famous brochure which examined the questions everywhere being asked, said, "What is the third order?—The nation. What is the nation?—Nothing. What must it become?—Everything." Thus to the saying of Louis XIV., "L'Etat c'est moi," Siéyès replied, "L'Etat c'est nous." He estimated the entire strength of the nobility of all ages and both sexes at less than 110,000: the clergy were certainly not more numerous.

The court, and especially the queen, the Count of Artois, the Princes of Condé and Conti, and the Polignacs, wished that the States-General should occupy themselves solely with matters of finance, and that after they had made up the deficit and paid the debts the deputies should return to their homes. But political reform was the best precaution against deficits. The nation understood that and wished it.

France suffered from two evils of which the one led to the other—a financial evil and a political evil; deficits and abuses. In order to cure the first, three things were necessary; stringent economy,

a less costly method of collecting the taxes, and a more equal distribution of taxation. To cure the second a new organisation of power was needed. The monarchy—which had so often been transformed since the time of the Roman emperors, in passing through the barbarous monarchy of Clovis, the feudal monarchy of Philip Augustus—the monarchy must again submit to transformation; for in its last form, that of absolute monarchy and the divine right of kings, it had given all that the country could expect from it, unity of territory and unity of laws. It had made France, but with the immense development of industry, commerce, science, and public spirit and with the mobility of wealth the interests of France were now too complex, her needs too numerous, to allow her to put herself under the omnipotent rule of one man, without some guarantee against possible misfortunes of royal birth or the imprudence of incapable ministers. The nation was now mature, she could take charge of her own affairs, she must tear away the already half-broken yoke which hampered her movements. Unfortunately a people can only shake itself free from its past through pain and suffering.

The Elections: Mirabeau.—At the news of the convocation of the States-General the agitation which reigned already in France redoubled. Reunions or, as they were called after the English word, *clubs* were everywhere organised; among others the *Club Breton* was founded, which sheltered within its walls the sinister society of the *Jacobins*. These clubs were not all amicable among themselves, they revealed the divisions which existed even among the upper classes. The clergy had their democracy in their country *curés;* the nobility had theirs in the country gentlemen; these were as a rule against the Revolution, and on seeing some of these great nobles, La Fayette, La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, the Counts of Montmorency and Lally-Telendal, the Vicomte de Noailles and others in favour of it, they said proudly, "They are still trafficking with our privileges." In Brittany the nobility and the bishops preferred rather to send no deputies than to admit the double representation of the third order; but the *curés* of Brittany protested and so divisions began among the clergy.

In Provence the nobles protested against the decision of the king's counsel. The Count de Mirabeau, an illustrious fugitive, attacked this protest hotly. Ejected by the nobles, who refused to allow him to sit amongst them, he called out these menacing words: "In every country, in every age, the aristocrats have relentlessly persecuted the friends of the people; and if, by

some strange chance, one of their own number has arisen to befriend the downtrodden it is he most of all whom they persecute, eager to inspire terror by the choice of such a victim. The last of the Gracchi perished in this way at the hands of the patricians ; struck down by a mortal wound, he invoked Heaven from the dust for the vengeance of the gods ; it was from this dust that Marius arose, Marius less famous for exterminating the Cimbri than for overthrowing the aristocracy of the Roman nobility." Mirabeau travelled all over Provence, dazzling the people by this eloquence which deserved a larger public. By his ascendancy over them he quelled disorders which had broken out from Aix to Marseilles, where he was received by salute of cannon and ringing of bells. His youth had been spent in "riotous living," but he had suffered much from the unjust severity of his father and the strictures of the government, which had issued seventeen *lettres de cachet* against him. He was imprisoned on the island of Ré, then at Château d'If, at the fort of Joux, at Vincennes, and finally condemned to death for seduction. When only twenty years old he had already written his *Essai sur le despotism*, bearing the following epigraph from Tacitus : *Dedimus profecto grande patientiae documentum.* Later he had to descend to writing pot-boilers. His name may have been besmirched—but his was a noble spirit. It was his voice that was to become the voice of the Revolution.

Demands for Reform.—The following were the demands of the people, which, as they were practically universal, were not contested:—

1. *Politics.*—Authority emanated from the people and was not to be exercised except by the agreement of the national representative assembly with the hereditary chief of the state. Other points were the urgent need of a constitution for France ; the exclusive right of the States-General to make laws, which before being promulgated must have obtained the royal sanction, to control public expenditure and to impose taxes ; the abolition of the financial immunity and personal privileges enjoyed by the clergy and nobility ; the suppression of the last vestiges of serfdom ; the admissibility of all citizens to public employment ; the responsibility of the agents of executive power.

2. *The Moral Order.*—Liberty of religion and of the press ; state education for poor and abandoned children.

3. *Judicial.*—Unity of legislation and jurisprudence ; suppression of exceptional jurisdiction ; publicity of debates ; mitigation of the penal laws ; reform of the rules of procedure.

4. *Administration.*—Creation of provincial assemblies to control the conduct of all the deputies of royal authority; equality of weights and measures; redivision of the kingdom according to the population and the revenue.

5. *Economics.*—Freedom of industry; suppression of internal customs houses; substitution for various taxes of a territorial and adjustable tax, which would deal with income but would never affect capital.

These reforms comprised all the demands of the Revolution, and they showed that a nation which was capable of asking for such things deserved to receive them. They became known as the principles of '89. Napoleon found a better name for them, "The truths of the Revolution."

Opening of the States-General (May 5, 1789).—On the 2nd of May all the deputies who had assembled at Versailles were presented to the king. On the fourth they went in solemn procession to the Church of St. Louis. All Paris was at Versailles. The procession appeared in the midst of a vast crowd, the third order in front, according to the custom of processions that the less important personages lead the way. Etiquette, arranged beforehand, had assigned to the deputies of the third order a modest black robe: they were greeted with a storm of applause. The embroidered cloaks of the nobles passed along in the midst of an ominous silence, save for some popular men among them who were cheered. The same silence greeted the clergy who followed. Enthusiasm did not break out again except for the king, who came last.

On the 5th of May the states were opened in the *Salle des Menus*, which was now to be called the *Salle des Trois Ordres*. The king was on his throne surrounded by princes of the blood; the court came next according to rank. The body of the hall was filled by the three orders. The clergy sat on the right of the throne and numbered about 291, there were forty-eight bishops or archbishops, thirty-five abbés or canons, 204 curés, and three monks. On the left sat the nobles to the number of 270; this number was composed of one prince of the blood, the Duke of Orleans, 240 nobles, twenty-eight magistrates of superior courts. And lastly, at the back on humble chairs sat the third order, composed of 584 members, twelve nobles, two priests, eighteen mayors or consuls of large towns, 162 magistrates of bailiwicks or country-towns, 212 advocates, sixteen doctors, and 162 merchants, proprietors, or farmers.

The king expressed in a few noble words his wishes for the

welfare of his people, he invited the states to begin their deliberations, recommending to their especial consideration the financial situation, and engaging them to find remedies for existing evils without being led away by desire for exaggerated innovations "which have taken possession of some minds."

Barentin, the Lord Privy Seal, followed the speech from the throne, trying to reduce the power of the states to the vote of taxes, to the discussion of a law against the press, and the reform of civil and criminal legislation. Then it was Necker's turn, director-general of finance; his speech was tedious and long-winded. But two passages in it excited close attention: that in which he announced an *actual* yearly deficit of 56 millions and a deficit of 266 millions in anticipation, and that in which he declared that the king asked the help of the states to found the prosperity of the kingdom on solid foundations. "Look for them," he said, "show them to the king, and you will find on his part the most generous assistance." Thus there was anarchy in council. The Lord Privy Seal, the mouthpiece of the court, considered the crisis more as a financier that as a politician or social reformer; the director of finance seemed to give every latitude to the States-General.

The Deputies of the Third Order declare Themselves a National Constituent Assembly (June 17 to July 9, 1789).—To establish the political and social unity of the nation by equality before the law and to guarantee it by freedom, that, in a few words, was the spirit of 1789. There were three classes; it was necessary that there should be only one. In the first problem to be solved—the determination of the powers of the deputies—the third order wished the proceedings to be in public; the clergy and nobility wished each order to determine in private the powers of its deputies. On the way in which this question was dealt with depended the mode of deliberation to be adopted for all other questions, also whether the vote should be by order or by individuals. Now these questions comprised the whole Revolution. Because if voting was by order, the majority was assured in advance to the clergy and nobility; if it was by the individual, the majority was already acquired by the deputies of the third order, more numerous than those of the other orders by 584 to 561.

For five weeks the deputies of the third order employed every means to induce the first two orders to unite with them; they begged the clergy to do so "in the name of the God of peace and in the public interest." The clergy were in an unfortunate

position ; their doctrines drew them to one side, their interests to the other : as a privileged body they were hostile to the Revolution, as interpreters of the Gospel they were in favour of it. Those of the clergy who profited least by the privileges of their cloth commenced the defection. On June 13, three *curés* of Poitou came to sit among the third order ; on succeeding days many others followed their example. At last, on June 17, on the motion of the Abbé Siéyès, the third order set up a *National Assembly*, because "this assembly is already composed of representatives sent directly by at least 96 per cent. of the nation and in order that such a large deputation may not be allowed to rest inactive on account of the absence of the deputies of certain bailiwicks or of certain classes of citizens" (June 17). Three weeks later, in order to make its mandate unmistakable, the word *Constituent* was added to the title.

The Oath of the Tennis Court (June 20).—This declaration, which opened the Revolution, threw the court and the first two orders into a panic. Nevertheless the clergy, in spite of the brilliant efforts of the Abbé Maury, decided for reunion with the majority of votes formed by the *curés* (June 19). The court was only the more annoyed by this, and forced the king to extreme measures. He was entreated to pronounce the dissolution of the states. He refused, but announced a royal session for June 22. In the meantime the hall where the sittings were held was guarded by soldiers under pretext of necessary preparations for the royal session, but in reality to prevent the clergy from carrying out their reunion. On June 20, Bailly, the president of the third order, found the doors closed. The deputies assembled in groups ; some wished to hold their meeting in the open air in the parade ground, after the fashion of the ancient *champs de mai ;* others discussed the situation under the very windows of the king. At last Bailly went into a hall laid out as a tennis court and there convoked a meeting. Between bare and sombre walls, in a hall devoid of furniture or seats, the deputies took a solemn oath that they would not separate till they had given France a constitution (June 20). The next day this hall, in its turn, was closed ; the Count of Artois required it to play tennis with his courtiers. But as the majority of the clergy were now united to the third order, they opened the church of St. Louis, and the assembly, already in part victorious on the question of the union of the orders, commenced its deliberations. From that time things moved quickly.

Fusion of the Orders (June 27).—The royal session was thus

held after a double check to the government. It began the rupture with the king. Louis XVI., who had the hall surrounded by soldiers, spoke menacing words; he excepted from the affairs to be dealt with in public those which concerned the ancient rights and constitutions of the three orders: "If you abandon me," he added, "I will myself attend to the welfare of my people, alone I will consider myself their true representative." He withdrew, having commanded the three orders to return to their respective assembly rooms. The first two orders obeyed, with the exception of certain of the clergy; the third order remained. The Marquis of Brézé, grand-master of ceremonies, re-entered and said, "Gentlemen, you have heard the command of the king." Mirabeau rose and replied, "We have heard, my lord, the intentions which have been suggested to the king: but you, who do not understand how to be his agent to the National Assembly, you, who have here neither place, nor voice, nor right to speak, it is not for you to repeat his words to us. . . . Go, tell your master that we are here by the will of the people, and that we are not to be ejected save by the bayonet!" To which Siéyès, addressing himself to the deputies, added these simple but powerful words, "Gentlemen, you are to-day just what you were yesterday; therefore proceed with your deliberations!" The assembly obeyed him. Its first act was to proclaim the inviolability of its members (June 23). The next day the majority of the clergy, the day after, forty-seven members of the nobility, headed by the Duke of Orleans, joined the third order.

On leaving the royal session, Louis XVI. had returned to his castle through the crowd, for the first time in silence. He walked up and down his room without speaking till Brézé came to tell him of the refusal of the third order to leave the hall. "Well, well," he broke out, as if annoyed, "if they do not wish to go, leave them alone!" The king had given in; Necker, who had been away, was recalled in alarm. He advised the king to ask the first two orders to unite with the third. They obeyed on June 27 and were received with fine courtesy, as if their coming was the lasting pledge of fraternal union. "We had need of brothers," said Bailly, "the family is now complete;" and the assembly was organised in thirty sections, to give the necessary activity to the great work of the constitution; the deputies of the third order chose all the presidents of sections from the ranks of the clergy and the nobles.

Fall of the Bastille (July 14).—But the court dreamt of violence afoot. Troops were recalled from all parts and concentrated

round Paris and Versailles, "to protect the assembly," it was said, "to maintain order." They numbered more than 30,000 men; the aged Marshal de Broglie, who had been given the command, put them on a war footing. Judging from the warlike preparations, the troops might have been in an enemy country. There were also foreign troops in the army, Swiss and German; they were greatly in favour because their fidelity was not doubted. The French regiments, on the contrary, were under the influence of prevailing ideas which circulated as freely in the army as elsewhere, for the army also groaned under the weight of numerous abuses. It must not be forgotten that the army was bought like any other property; that the superior ranks were reserved to the nobles of four quarterings; that in the budget the pay of officers figured as 46 millions, that of the soldiers only as 44 millions, not to mention the many charges kept off the soldiers' pay. It must be remembered that Marceau was a common private; that Hoche, sergeant of the guards, was reduced to embroidering officers' waistcoats which he sold in the cafés in order to buy books.

The presence of foreign troops was an all too evident menace. Paris was disturbed by this military display. All that went forward at Versailles was known in Paris immediately. The chief scene of agitation was the garden of the Palais Royal. A table served as a tribune.

All the doings of the assembly and the court were commented on. The soldiers of the French Guard, able from their long sojourn in the capital to enter into the feelings of the people, associated themselves with the general rejoicings at the success of the assembly. Their colonel imprisoned eleven of them; the people went to the Abbaye and set them free. The National Assembly, informed of this violation of discipline and law, obtained the king's pardon for the soldiers on condition that they returned immediately to their prison. The assembly demanded the disbanding of the troops whose presence irritated the people. "Do they not see," said Mirabeau, speaking of the imprudent counsellors of the king, "by what a fatal chain of circumstances the wisest men of the day are exasperated beyond the bounds of moderation, and by what terrible forces an infatuated people are precipitated towards excesses, the first idea of which would made them shudder?"

Louis XVI. ventured on this fatal path: instead of dismissing the troops news came of the recall and then the exile of Necker. (July 11th). The next day Paris caught fire like a volcano; the

Palais Royal was full of red-hot rage; a young man, boiling over with indignation and eloquence, Camille Desmoulins, sprang on a table, a pistol in his hand, "Citizens," he cried, "the exile of Necker is the tocsin of a St. Bartholomew of patriots! This very evening the Swiss and German battalions will be marched to the Champ de Mars to cut our throats! There is only one resource for us, that is to fly to arms!" The leaves of the chestnut trees were taken as a cockade; the crowd besieged the studio of Curtius, the sculptor, and taking busts of Necker and the Duke of Orleans, carried them about the streets in triumphal procession. They encountered a military outpost in the Place Vendôme, who stopped the mob and killed one of the French Guard. At the same time the Prince of Lambesc, colonel of the German troops, made a charge on the gardens of the Tuileries to disperse the crowd who were attacking the soldiers by throwing stones at them. An old man fell under the hoofs of the horses. At this moment screams were heard from the town, where citizens were being murdered. The regiment of the French Guard came from its barracks fully armed and fired on a detachment of Germans; they then took their stand on the *Place Louis XV.* Baron de Bezenval, who commanded the forces on the *Champs Elysées*, could have overpowered them, but he had no orders; he did not dare to act, and so fell back towards Versailles. During this tumult the assembly attempted to secure the return of Necker, but Louis XVI. refused absolutely. The Comte de Virieu demanded that in this time of grave peril the deputies should renew the oath of June 20; some of the nobles hesitated. "The assent is unanimous," cried Mathieu de Montmorency. "The constitution must come," said the Comte de Clermont-Tonnerre, "or else we cease to exist." An address was sent to the king asking that the troops should be withdrawn. This calm firmness did credit to the assembly. In Paris things moved more quickly and went further. There was already practically a new municipality, formed by the electors, which replaced the old in the confidence of the people. The electors were the citizens full of resolution. The election of the deputies for Paris being over they had continued to meet to have their official statements and accounts corroborated, and had obtained a room for their meetings in the Hôtel de Ville. There without official orders, without a title, but with an authority obeyed and respected by the whole town, they constituted themselves on July 13 an administrative body. The people loudly demanded arms in order to defend themselves against the probable attacks of the military. The electors decreed

that they should form themselves into a *Garde Bourgeoisie:* they numbered at first 200, soon 400 men, for each of the sixty districts. But weapons were necessary. The 14th July was spent in demanding them from Flesselles, the provost of the merchants, who in order to gain time twice promised them without redeeming his promises, and thus gave rise to furious anger against him. Fifty thousand pikes were made in thirty-six hours; 30,000 muskets, sabres, and cannon were taken to the *Invalides*. From the 12th July the troops which occupied the *Champs Elysées*, menaced by an attack, had fallen back and the Parisians were masters of the town, dominated by the sombre and many times accursed fortress. *To the Bastille!* was the general cry. Crowds came running from every quarter. The old soldiers, Élie and Hullin, directed the people: only a small number had arms and could take part in the action. The governor, De Launay, had only 200 soldiers, either Swiss or unfit men, as a garrison: but the fortress was so strong, especially against an attack of this kind, that the assailants had to face a murderous fight of several hours before they took possession of it. They entered at last, having lost nearly a third of their number—171 killed and wounded.

The men who had fought so bravely would have scorned to kill their prisoners. But behind them—*the victors of the Bastille* as they were called—came bands of robbers, who during the preceding days had pillaged the town and who on this day set themselves to murder and bloodshed. Élie and Hullin wore themselves out in vain efforts to save the prisoners. De Launay was killed. The provost of the merchants, Flesselles, Major de Salbray, and many soldiers met the same fate. Their heads stuck on pikes were carried through the town: the populace began to taste blood.

The National Guard: The Tricolour Cockade.—When the Duke of Liancourt told the king of the fall of the Bastille, he said, "But is it then a revolt?" "No, sire," was the answer, "it is a revolution." The evening before his army had been powerless; to-day his fortress had fallen. The hour had struck. The grandson of Louis XIV. proceeded to the assembly where strife had already broken out. Mirabeau, addressing himself to the deputies who were about to be sent to the king, had cried: "Tell him plainly, tell him that the hordes of foreigners by whom the country is infested were visited yesterday by princes, by princesses, and by courtiers; that they were flattered; that they received exhortations and presents; tell him that all night long those foreign satellites, loaded with gold and filled with wine, predicted in

their impious songs the subjection of France, that their coarse vows invoked the destruction of the National Assembly: tell him that even in his own palace the dances of his courtiers were mingled with the strains of this barbarous music; tell him that such scenes as these preceded St. Bartholomew!" When the arrival of the king was announced, "The silence of the people is the lesson of kings," said the Bishop of Chartres; and he demanded that the king should be received by the assembly with coldness and in silence. But when Louis XVI. appeared without guards and declared that he would do nothing without the nation, that he relied upon the National Assembly, that he consented to the sending back of the German troops, that he would recall Necker to the ministry—the applause broke out in transports and an immense crowd followed him on his way back to Paris. He came into an innumerable multitude, armed with muskets, pikes, hatchets, and pieces of artillery; to disguise the menace while showing their power, the people had hidden their cannon under flowers and branches. Bailly, who had newly been made Mayor of Paris, received the king at the gates and gave him the keys of the town. "They are the same," he said, "which were presented to Henry IV. He reconquered his people, sire; to-day it is the people who have reconquered their king." Louis could have won all hearts on that day, but he was not the kind of man for such scenes. The Revolution continued in his presence. La Fayette, who had been made general of the bourgeois militia, hastened to organise it. He gave it a name which Siéyès had proposed, that of the *National Guard*, and for cockade he took the two ancient colours of Paris, blue and red, and between them he placed the white, the colour of the monarchy and of France. "Take this," he said in presenting it; "here is a cockade which will encircle the globe."

Abolition of Privileges (August 4).—The agitation which had begun in Paris soon spread over the whole country; violence was resorted to. In many places the peasants set fire to convents and châteaux in order to destroy the ancient titles and feudal charters. From the first months of 1789 insurrection had broken out in Provence. The Dauphiné, Beaujolais, Macon, and Burgundy were overrun by armed bands, and the disorder spread to other provinces. It became of the first importance to prevent revolt among the peasantry. This was attempted by important reforms. The nobles gave the example: the Duke d'Aiguillon, the Vicomte de Noailles, Mathieu de Montmorency offered to give up their rights; others followed their example: all privileges

were abolished. Seigniorial rights, legal rights, ecclesiastical tithes, personal privileges, privileges of provinces, of towns, and so on. The stipulation was certainly made that these rights were ceded to all except those who abused personal liberty. The day was none the less memorable, it saw the birth of equality. The assembly decreed that a solemn *Te Deum* should be celebrated in all churches as a thanksgiving for the abolition of the reign of feudalism, and the king having accepted the sacrifice of the privileged classes was given the title of *Restorer of the Liberty of France.*

Opposition of the Court: The 5th and 6th of October, 1789.—One of the first cares of the assembly was to vote, after the example of the American Congress, a declaration of the rights of the man and the citizen. This was done in order to show the fundamental principles on which the constitution was established; by September 21 the chief dispositions were already voted. There were those who wished to divide the legislative power into two chambers, as in England, and to give the king the ultimate right of veto; they were defeated. Mounier, Clermont-Tonnerre, Lally-Tolendal retired from the committee. It was the abdication of the most moderate members of the assembly. On both sides influence had passed to men who were determined to go to the utmost limits in attack, as in resistance. Around the king, and in spite of him, the idea of resorting to force was again mooted. The Flanders regiment was recalled to Versailles. Breteuil had himself proposed, towards the end of August, that the court should take refuge in Metz, beside the army of Bouillé. Louis XVI. refused to take this step, which would have led to civil war. Imprudent spirits hastened the catastrophe after another fashion.

The great theatre of the castle at Versailles was taken by the bodyguard for a banquet they wished to give to the officers of the Flanders regiments, and at which other regiments were also to be represented, even the foreign regiments and the National Guard. In the middle of the festivities, the king appeared, followed by the queen carrying the dauphin in her arms. The band played the air, *O Richard o mon roi, l'universe t'abandonne!* then some foreign airs, the March of the Uhlans; wine circulated, heads grew heavy, the ladies distributed white cockades, and the tricolour, it was said, was trampled under foot (October 1).

And Paris was dying of hunger. A hailstorm of unequalled severity had on the 13th July of the preceding year destroyed

a large part of the harvest, from the banks of the Charente to the banks of the Scheldt. A winter of great severity followed; there was hard frost without intermission from November 25 till January 13, 1789. There was distress in many provinces; agitation and unrest changed it to famine. For all these months Paris had lived from day to day, receiving at night the flour for the next day's bread. When the news of this orgy at Versailles came to these starving people, the inconsiderate nature of the provocation caused insurrection to break out. An army of women banded themselves together and crying *Bread! Bread!* they marched to Versailles, imagining vainly that if only the king could be brought to Paris they would have abundance.

This procession was followed by men also, clamouring for bread; La Fayette, who had vainly opposed their going, was himself carried along by this army of Parisians. It arrived before the castle; a conflict which began with the bodyguard lasted till evening, and began again the following morning. The queen, against whom the infuriated people shouted threats of death, was only saved by the devotion of her guards, who were killed in defending her door. La Fayette, overcome with fatigue after thirty-six hours of anguish and anxiety, had left the castle. In his absence it was forced; seven of the guards perished; five men belonging to the crowd and the National Guard were killed. La Fayette arrived hurriedly in time to save seventeen of the guards, who were about to be shot by the people. He succeeded in having the inner rooms cleared of the mob. But it was necessary that the king should appear and agree to go to Paris. The queen wished to follow him. The journey was not without danger for her. La Fayette took her on to a balcony, and not being able to make himself heard, he respectfully kissed his hand to her, as a sign of reconciliation between the monarchy and the Revolution. The crowd applauded: cries of *Vive la reine* were heard. Some minutes later the royal party left in the midst of this rough crowd, which conducted them like prisoners to their own capital (5th and 6th October). The assembly committed the unpardonable mistake of following the king to Paris and installing him in the chapel of the archbishop, and afterwards in the riding-school near the Tuileries. From that moment the assembly found itself, like the king, in the power of the populace, to whom the success of the expedition to Versailles had made the fatal revelation that discussion could be replaced by force, that both assembly and government could be subjugated by a day's rioting.

Excesses of the People: Emigration.—Culpable excesses had already taken place. Men of blood and destruction had appeared such as are always to be found in popular risings and who make wise men shudder at the thought of revolution, even when necessary and legitimate. Since the winter, bands of such men had terrorised the country districts and even the towns. In Paris the municipality had been forced to provide a sort of detention-barracks for 20,000 men. It was an army ready for any popular rising. It had to be guarded by cannon charged with grape-shot. But these unfortunate men could not be entirely prevented from finding their way, one by one, into the town. They would be found among the crowd in the Place de Grève, near the Palais Royal. Such men would lightly commit murder and carry the heads of their victims in procession through the streets. On April 28, even before the meeting of the States-General, the factory of Réveillon was broken into and plundered as well as the Faubourg St. Antoine; De Launay and Flesselles were murdered after the fall of the Bastille, murders followed by those of Foulon the minister, Berthier the intendant, and some members of the Royal Guard. In the provinces the peasants, not always content with destroying the feudal titles, would knock down the towers, destroy the drawbridges, and sometimes even kill the owners. Such violence is for ever to be deplored for the immense harm it did to the cause of public liberty. Terror reigned in the court and in the châteaux. The most imprudent of the king's counsellors, his brother the Count of Artois, the Princes of Condé and Conti, the Dukes of Bourbon and Enghien, the Polignacs, and others, were the first to take refuge in flight the morning after the fall of the Bastille. Others were quick to follow their example. They left the king alone in the midst of a people whose anger they had provoked, in directing the arms of foreigners against the flesh and blood of their native land.

But if there were deeds to be deplored, there was also heroism to be proud of. Larivière, one of the electors, in order to protect Berthier the intendant, who had been arrested, went with him in the carriage that took him to Paris. Berthier was fired at, attacked by swords and sabres; Larivière leant across him and protected him with his own body. In Paris the fury of the mob was at its height, but for some time the intendant was not recognised. At length a voice cried that it was Berthier who lifted his hat; at once twenty muskets were aimed at the carriage; Larivière at the same moment lifted *his* hat also.

Another day one of the French Guard saved his colonel, the Duke de Chatelet, whom the people wished to put to death. "What is your name?" asked the duke afterwards. "My name," the man replied, "is that of all my comrades." And among those gentlemen who left France in obedience to a false conception of loyalty, how many there were who, like Chateaubriant, felt the bitterness of eating the bread of strangers, who carried with them cherished memories of their native land, love and pride of country. A French officer followed the Emperor Francis II. to a review of Austrian troops. The emperor, proud of their splendid bearing, turned and said, "There are men who could beat the *sans-culottes*." "That remains to be seen," replied the emigrant.

The Dual Movement which hastened the Revolution.—From the 6th October, 1789, to 30th September, 1791, the day on which the National Assembly dispersed, France was drawn in two different directions. On one side the Revolution—begun by practically the whole people, though directed for a time by disciples of Montesquieu, who demanded only for France a constitution based on that of England—the Revolution tended to pass into the hands of democratic leaders and became every day more democratic. On the other side, the court hid its chagrin under a mask of docility, and by the suspicions and fears which actuated its conduct precipitated the inexorable approach of the Revolution.

The Work of the Assembly: Political and Civil Reforms.—Between these opposing tendencies, the National Assembly pursued the course of its important work, putting down with one hand, building up with the other, with an energy sometimes rash but more often well-inspired. By the enumeration of its principal decrees it will be seen how far France has preserved its reform in civil affairs.

After having deprived the monarchy of the right of making laws, imposing taxes, deciding between peace and war, the king was relegated to the position of first functionary of the state, with a yearly grant of 25 million livres.

The dissenters, the press, industry, and commerce were free from all restraint. Birthrights and entails were suppressed. The equal division of property among all the children was made obligatory; confiscation was abolished in virtue of the principle that expiation must be personal, like the fault. Protestants and Jews were admitted to all civic and civil rights, and the Protestants were given back such of their property as had been

incorporated in the domains of the state; the mulattoes of the colonies were given civil rights.

The assembly also abolished titles, annihilating the nobility and clergy as orders, reducing the nobles to the status of citizens, the priests to that of public functionaries. It established equality of punishment and diminished the number of cases in which the death penalty might be inflicted; it declared all French citizens—as far as religion and birth were concerned—to be admissible to every form of public employment, to every military rank; all were taxable in proportion to their means; finally, the old arbitrary lines of provincial demarcation were replaced by the division of the country into departments. "The territory of France," as the law of September 28, 1791, declared, "is free to its uttermost extent, as are the people who inhabit it."

Creation of Departments (January 15, 1790).—There had been departments since 1783, nearly equal in size, of which the boundaries and denominations were not borrowed from ancient usages, but were determined by the configuration of the land, the rivers, and the mountains. Each department was divided into districts, each district into cantons, each canton into communes or municipalities to the number of 44,828. This territorial division to which all the new administrative organisation had to conform led the assembly at this critical moment to trench to the quick on the privileges of the clergy and nobility, which had up till that time only been abolished in words. That caused resistance, disturbance, and finally civil war.

National Wealth: Assignats.—The crying needs of the treasury had not yet been met. Mirabeau, in holding before the public the threat of *hideous bankruptcy*, had secured by a proposition of Necker's that every citizen should make the patriotic sacrifice of a quarter of his income. This was received with enthusiastic acclamation. It was a temporary expedient. Something better and more lasting was needed. On the memorable night of August 4 the Bishop of Uzès had said: "Would that I had property! What a joy it would be to me to divide it among the working men! But we are only trustees." For the assembly, regarding the property of the clergy as a trust, had decided that such property should be given back to the nation which had in former times given it to the clergy in trust. But the clergy claimed ownership, as a right of long and uninterrupted possession, they claimed it in the interests of their calling, of hospitals, of the poor. "What is to become," cried the Bishop of Aix, "of the promises we have made, that our properties shall be preserved inviolate

and sacred?" But the clergy, ceasing to be a corporate body, lost its proprietary rank. The state then took the properties by right of disinheritance. That was decided on December 2, 1789, in spite of the efforts of Maury and Cazalès; the domains of the Church were put at the disposition of the nation, and the government was authorised to sell them to the amount of 400 millions, on the condition that the state should be responsible for the proper upkeep of public worship, for the maintenance of the clergy, and the relief of the poor. The lands of the crown, the property of emigrants (of which the confiscation was afterwards ordered, July 27, 1792), were also declared national property and became, in the apt expression of the time, the dowry of the constitution.

To sell all these lands, to divide them and distribute them to the nation, was a powerful way of attaching the country people to the Revolution. "To create an army of revolutionary interests," as Mirabeau said, it was decided that the state should issue a paper currency of short duration, which would be received in preference for the purchase of national property. These *assignats* were destroyed as soon as they returned again to the hands of the state. And so, as the actual acres of ground could not be put in circulation, the sign which stood for them was used. That was the origin of the *assignats*, which only fell into bad repute when their rightful uses were abused. The clergy, despoiled of their property, were indemnified by salaries granted to all their members, and by pensions given to those members of religious orders whose convents were suppressed. Seventy-seven millions were inscribed in the budget for expenses connected with the Church.

Judicial Reforms.—The assembly had destroyed the parliaments by a simple decree which put them in indefinite vacation. But it imposed a fertile principle in the separation of administrative and judicial powers, and it instituted for the whole kingdom a *court of cassation*, which, judging appeals in the last resort, had the mission of maintaining the unity of legislation and jurisprudence. The assembly also instituted the following smaller courts: in the departments a *criminal court* which was assisted by a jury; in the districts a *civil court;* in the cantons a *justice of the peace* and a *bureau of conciliation;* in the chief towns a *consular court;* and finally, to have some check on the conduct of high public functionaries, and for crimes against the defence of the realm, a *high court of justice* (May, 1791). Wishing that justice should always proceed from the reason and

conscience of the magistrates, the assembly decreed that judgments must allege their motives, and to put an end to the chaos of the 400 different customs of France, it inscribed in the constitution that a code of civil laws had been made "common to the whole kingdom." The magistrates were no longer elected for life, but for ten years only; that was an unfortunate measure, which put the judges in a position of dependence upon those judged.

Financial Reforms.—The assembly had abolished some of the taxes which had been so numerous and so vexatious in the old regime, such as the *taille*, *vingtième*, *capitation*, *dimes*, *aides*, *gabelle*, and others. But it declared that every citizen must contribute to the public revenue in proportion to his means, and it decreed a tax on patents, to tap the wealth of industry and commerce; a sliding scale to reach fluctuating incomes; a land-tax to secure a share of the profits of the land. The assembly retained in a simplified form the rights of registering, of stamping, of mortgage; taxes easy to collect and founded on acknowledged rights. It abolished internal customs houses, but retained those on the frontier. Finally, to encourage industry as well as to protect it, primary materials and substances were allowed to come into the kingdom duty free. To facilitate trade a uniform system of weights and measures was agreed upon, which the members of the *Académie française* determined in correspondence with the Royal Society of London.

The Federation (July 14, 1790).—Thus were the vows for the political and social renovation of France realised. But the fears of some, the impatience of others, the misdeeds of a few, caused the aim to be exceeded, and the noble edifice, erected by the labours of a century, crumbled to pieces, only to be raised again after horrible and mutilating experiences.

In the middle of the year 1790, the horizon was dark with clouds, some of them menacing and bloody, but the political success of the great work was still believed in. There was a moment of universal confidence and boundless hope at the festival of the federation, given by the Parisians in the *Champ de Mars* for this very reason to the deputies of the army and the departments. Since November of the preceding year, all the nation—townspeople, country people, and soldiers—had fraternised with each other, all uniting for the common defence, in the joy of their native land, which had been given back to them. The local federations united, the one with the other, and ended by forming a grand federation of France, which

sent 100,000 representatives to Paris on July 14, 1790. An altar dedicated to France (*l'autel de la patrie*) was erected in the *Champ de Mars;* an immense crowd filled that vast plain; La Fayette, the commander of the National Guards of the whole kingdom, was the first to take the oath of fidelity to the constitution, which millions of voices repeated. The king took his oath in a loud voice, "I, King of the French, swear and declare that I will use all my power, delegated to me by the constitutional law of the state, to maintain the constitution decreed by the National Assembly accepted by me; to cause its laws to be carried out." The queen was in a balcony of the *École Militaire;* carried away by the general enthusiasm, she took the dauphin in her arms and presented him to the people as if to associate him with the oath taken by his father. At this moment the rain, which had fallen heavily all day, stopped suddenly, and by a happy chance—which our forefathers would have regarded as a sign of the intervention of the gods—the sun pierced the clouds and flooded with its brilliant rays the altar at which the *Te Deum* was being sung. An outburst of joy and enthusiasm rent the skies. This was the great day of the Revolution; the spirit of concord and fraternal devotion filled all hearts, the prevailing exhilaration found expression that evening in dancing before the Bastille. But to this brilliant festival there was no morrow.

The Clubs: Jacobins, Cordeliers, and Others.—The Revolution had made such extraordinary progress that new ideas, societies, and clubs sprang up on all sides, each one endeavouring to drive public opinion in its particular direction. Some began to show violence against the clergy, against the court, even against the assembly itself. The most active of all these societies was the *Breton* club, which had left Versailles at the same time as the government and had chosen as its headquarters the convent of the *Jacobins,* from which it took its name. It was still under the influence of men who, although eager and enthusiastic, were yet moderate in their views, the two Lameths, Duport, Barnave, and it was afterwards to be ruled by Robespierre. The club of '89 served as a meeting-place for two men prominent in the early days of the Revolution, Siéyès and La Fayette. But already that terrible club had been opened which Danton directed at the convent of the *Cordeliers.* The press excited sedition: Camille Desmoulins in his paper *Les Révolutions de Brabant et de Flandres;* the odious Marat in his *Ami du Peuple,* in which he demanded still the sacrifice of 800 heads. The provinces were as agitated

as Paris, there had been disturbances everywhere ; they were especially volcanic in the Midi, but occurred also at Marseilles, Valence, Nîmes, Montauban, and Toulouse. The insurrectionists gathered an army ; M. de Bouillé engaged in a bloody struggle in order to quell the rebellious soldiers of Nancy, who had revolted against their officers (August, 1790). Necker, seeing his powerlessness, tendered his resignation (September, 1790).

Death of Mirabeau (April 2, 1791).—Seeing that the maintenance of public order was relegated by the constitution to the executive power, the National Assembly felt itself morally obliged to interpose its authority—more respected than that of the king—in putting a stop to the prevailing anarchy. Mirabeau, who gained greater ascendancy every day, began with an audacity and candour which made his popularity supreme to insist on the repression of factions. "I would not have striven only for destruction," he wrote to the Comte de la Marche. He even approached the court and treated with the king and queen, not to annihilate but to arrest and consolidate the Revolution. He thought himself strong enough, had he been called to the ministry, to control two torrents at once, that of the passions of the people and that of the passions of the aristocracy : a proof that death saved his reputation. Worn out before his time by all manner of excesses, he did not cease to speak, to write, to agitate, till all at once his powers deserted him. When it became known that a serious malady threatened his life, the Chaussée d'Antin, where he lived, was thronged with an anxious crowd which seemed to be labouring under a national calamity. The bulletins which the doctor issued from time to time were eagerly awaited ; they had to be printed to satisfy the crowd, that all might read them. The king sent daily to hear the latest news. The night before his death the invalid heard a cannon shot : "Have the funeral ceremonies of Achilles begun already ?" he asked. After a night of grave anxiety and before the day broke, "My friend," he said to Cabanis, "I will die to-day. At such a time there is only one thing to do, that is to surround oneself with sweet perfumes, to cover oneself with flowers, to listen to soft music, in fact to enter sweetly into that sleep from which there is no awakening." Then he had his bed drawn close up to the window and watched with rapture the brilliant glory of the spring sun, the reawakening beauty of his garden. He died on April 2, 1791, scarcely forty-two years old. One of his last sayings was : "My heart is heavy with regrets for the monarchy, the ruins of which will be the spoil of factions." All the members of the National

Assembly, all Paris, escorted his coffin to the Pantheon, where he was buried and which was afterwards dedicated " to the great men " of France by " a grateful country."

The Civil Constitution of the Clergy.—With the death of Mirabeau, the king ceased to hear moderate counsels or advice in favour of a constitutional regime, which was indeed against all his own inclinations, and which was abhorred by the queen. Louis was wounded, not only in his authority as king, but also in his feelings as a man, by the threatening orders against emigrants, and in his conscience as a Christian by the measures the assembly had taken concerning the clergy.

The clergy had already ceased to be proprietors and to form a separate order in the state ; the number of convents had been limited to one in each municipality ; the taking of monastic vows had been suspended and legal sanction refused to those which had been taken before this measure, so that the bonds of religion were now only bonds of conscience and of faith. The assembly went even further ; it reduced the number of archbishops in France from 135 to 83, one to each department, and as it had put everything on a basis of election, it resolved to do the same with the Church, where election had flourished originally, where it had existed to a certain degree before the *concordat* of 1516. The assembly decreed that those who elected the administrators of the departments and the deputies to the National Assembly should also elect the bishops and the curés (July 12, 1791). This *civil constitution of the clergy*, to which all priests were ordered to take the oath, was a cause of grievous vexation to the established hierarchy of the Church. It made the bishops practically independent of the pope because it substituted the canonical institution given by the metropolitan for the canonical institution given by the Holy Father. The ecclesiastical committee which proposed this reform, while desiring fervently that France should remain Catholic, yet encroached on the rights which the whole Catholic world recognised as those of the sovereign pontiff. From a religious point of view there was a contradiction in this measure, seeing that France was more truly Catholic even than Rome herself, perhaps not in dogma, but certainly in discipline, ceremonial institution, and spiritual jurisdiction. The measure committed also from a political point of view a grave imprudence, because it gave permission to the adversaries of the new social order " to set the enthusiasm of religion over against the enthusiasm of liberty."

Some of the provinces even turned against the Revolution after

the pope had prohibited the oath (March 10 and April 13, 1791). The great majority of the bishops refused to take it ; those who did take it formed that body of clergy recognised by the state under the title of *Priests bound by oath* or *Constituted Priests*. The exercise of their priestly functions was forbidden to the others. There were thus two bodies : the one a public body which laboured in churches deserted by the faithful, the other clandestine, a body which met in lonely out-of-the-way places, in the depths of forests, where crowds would flock together ; this was spiritually the more powerful body. Schism had entered into the Church ; persecutions and war followed in its train. It was in vain that an eloquent preacher of Poitou appealed to the spirit of the Gospel that if the first Apostle was put under authority, if every one was put under authority, why should the Church be excepted ? His sage counsels were not listened to. The Revolution had the nobility already against it ; the priests would now enter into the conflict : a terrible civil war filled France with terror, with crime, with bloodshed.

Opposition of the King.—When the pope decreed resistance, the king had opposed his veto ; he did not raise his opposition for five months (December 26, 1791). In his own heart, and in the minds of the court and all Europe, the king was no longer free ; all power was wanting. The representative of a past which every day received some new blow, what sure support could he find in the midst of these crumbling ruins? And he had not sincerely looked for support in the new order of things. The court still counted on the good faith of the army, and on the kings of others countries, who looked with alarm on the spectacle of this tremendous revolution at whose burning words and dreadful deeds the whole world stood aghast. The idea of flight was mooted ; of an appeal to the kings. From December, 1790, the king sent many secret messages to foreign powers.

Flight of the King (June 20, 1791).—The Count of Artois and the Prince of Condé, who arranged for the extensive emigration that was going on, were occupied in thinking out means for the safety of Louis XVI.: the Count of Artois entered, with the consent of the king, into a secret convention with the Emperor Leopold. The Kings of Austria, Prussia, Piedmont, and Spain, as well as the Swiss, engaged to send to the frontiers of France, ready to enter it at a given signal, bodies of troops amounting in all to 100,000 men. (Conference of Mantua, May, 1791.)

It was thus that Louis XVI. authorised the blockade and the invasion of France : but he wished first to be free. His project

of escape leaked out among the people, who, already irritated by the departure of his aunts for Italy, would not allow the king to leave Paris for an instant, not even to go to St. Cloud. He left the Tuileries on the night of June 20 with the queen, the dauphin, his daughter, his sister Elizabeth, and Madame Tourzel, the governess of his children. A huge coach met them at Bondy and conveyed the whole party towards Montmédy, Bouillé having been ordered to guard the road with soldiers. But at St. Ménehould the king was recognised by Drouet, the Post-master-General: at Varennes he was arrested by the procurator of the commune, and taken away in charge of commissioners sent from Paris, where his flight had been discovered some hours after his departure. Barnave was one of his guards: from that day he tried to assume the mantle of Mirabeau; to save the king by vindicating the constitution to the court, the court to the assembly.

Louis XVI. re-entered his capital in the midst of an immense, silent crowd. A notice had been generally posted up: "Those who cheer the king will be beaten: those who insult the king will be hung." While the king was on his way from Varennes, the assembly, not in the least agitated, had declared that the government was not interrupted, that executive power rested in the hands of the ministers under the direction of the assembly, that relations with foreign powers were being carried on: finally that 300,000 men of the National Guard were being raised by the whole of France to defend her territory against enemy forces. These decrees issued in the space of a few hours, the assembly stoically took up the order of the day, a discussion on the penal code.

Affair of the Champ de Mars (July 17, 1791).—The king was suspended from his powers and put under the supervision of a guard; but when the assembly discussed his being put on trial, or his loss of rights, the constitutionals—who were still in the majority and who had separated from the Jacobins to form a club of more moderate views, the *Feuillants*—insisted on a declaration stating only that if the king should retract his oath of fidelity to the constitution, if he put himself at the head of an army to make war against the nation, he should be held to have abdicated. That was not enough for those who, on hearing of the flight of the king, had said: "Now we are rid of our chief embarrassment"; or "If the king has gone, the nation remains." From that day republican ideas dared to make themselves publicly heard. A petition, framed in violent terms by the

Cordeliers and *Jacobins*, which ordered the assembly to pronounce the king's forfeiture of his rights, was taken to the altar of France in the *Champ de Mars* to receive signatures. On Sunday, July 17, a great crowd gathered in Paris and the surrounding districts. The clubs were agitated: Santerre stirred up the people of the suburbs. The assembly, disquieted by this movement which was disturbing the people, issued a general order to the National Guard and to the Mayor of Paris to provide for the safety of the populace and to disperse the crowds. Troops under La Fayette entered the *Champ de Mars* and ranged themselves in front of the *École Militaire;* Bailly brought his men in from the direction of Chaillot: they were received by a fusillade of stones. One man fired on La Fayette, another on Bailly. The mayor had the red flag hoisted and proclaimed martial law. The soldiers were ordered to fire a volley without shot: that had no result: they then loaded their muskets and fired: many of the crowd fell dead and wounded. The excited people were brought to their senses by this first blood spilt in the maintenance of public order, but Bailly paid with his life for his act of legitimate and necessary firmness.

The King re-establishes his Office (September 14).—The assembly, worn out by its prolonged labours, longed for respite. But it was eager to achieve the constitution. On the 14th September the king, who had up till then been a prisoner in the Tuileries, accepted the constitution and swore by a solemn oath that he would observe it. The assembly reinstated him in his powers, but could it give him that moral authority which he had lost? Could he himself impose on his court his desire to maintain loyally the new laws?

Constitution of 1791.—The constitution gave the legislative power to a permanent assembly which the king had not the power to dissolve, and which was to be re-constituted every two years by a general election. It alone had the initiative of making laws, but it left to the king, with executive powers, the option of suspending national measures for four years, except in the case of questions of finance (right of veto). The electorate was divided in *Primary Assemblies*, which in the headquarters of each canton compiled the electoral roll; and *Electoral Assemblies*, which elected the deputies to the National Assembly, the administrators of departments, of the district, and the judges of the law courts. The *Primary Assemblies* comprised the *active* citizens, that is, those of twenty-five years of age or over who were inscribed on the roll of the National Guard, who had resided

for at least one year in the canton, and who paid direct contribution to the state equal in local value to three days' work. The *Electoral Assemblies* were formed of citizen-proprietors, or tenants of property bringing an income equal in local value to from 200 to 500 days' work. All the *active* citizens were eligible. Domestic servants were excluded from the *Primary Assemblies*.

The constitution of 1791, which retained more than two million electors, was odious to the court and to Europe as being too revolutionary; it was hated no less by the people, and especially after July 17, as being too aristocratic. It was reproached on the one side for having demolished all the favourite abuses; on the other for having set a lower limit than had ever been set before to the exercise of political rights.

Closure of the Constitution (September 30, 1791).—The constitution finished with dignified words of liberty and concord. It proclaimed a general amnesty, suppressed the difficulties put in its way, and annulled—in order to recall the emigrants to their native land—all the laws of exclusion. But the emigrants did not return. Time had not been taken into consideration in the constitution, and time is one of the supreme rulers in the destiny of man. But in spite of its faults the constitution deserves the gratitude of France, for if its political reforms have practically all perished, its civil reforms survived and were confirmed by the Code of Napoleon, the authors of which followed the great principles the constitution had set forth.

From among its members a few names stand out in bold relief: Siéyès, Mounier, Malouet, Cazalès, Maury, Barnave, the two Lameths, Lully, Dupont, and above all Mirabeau, who, had he lived, might even have reconciled the monarchy and the Revolution. Mirabeau was the author of the noble phrase explaining the new era which seemed about to open: "Law is the sovereign of the world."

The constitution forbade the re-election of its members, a mistaken step of a too-generous disinterest, which deprived the assembly of the insight and experience so dearly gained by the veterans of the Revolution.

CHAPTER LX

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (1791-1792)

The Legislative Assembly (October 1, 1791, to September 21, 1792).—The Legislative Assembly, so insignificant between its great and terrible sisters, the Constituent and the Convention, began its sittings on October 1, 1791; they ended on September 21, 1792. It was a transition between the limited monarchy of the Constitutionals and the dictatorship of the *Montagnards*.[1] Its leaders, the *Girondins*,[2] Brissot, Pétion, Vergniaud, Gaudet, Gensonné, Ducos, Isnard, and Valazé, worked solely for the overthrow of the monarchy, but in leaving the extreme parties to deal with the affairs of the republic, which they did with an energy and ruthlessness leading even to bloodshed, they lost the chance of moderating such excessive zeal.

Stringent Measures against the Unconstitutional Priests and the Emigrants.—The spirit of the new assembly revealed itself from the first in a discussion which arose as to whether the king was still to receive the titles of *Sire* and *Majesty*. But more serious matters soon claimed its attention. Three great dangers threatened the Revolution: the unconstitutional priests by their refusal to take the civil oath were causing trouble in the provinces; the emigrants had formed centres of intrigue against their native land in Brussels, Worms, and Coblentz; and the foreign powers, obsessed by the idea of reinstating Louis XVI. in his rights, publicly declared their intentions by the *Declaration of Pilnitz*, signed by the King of Prussia and the Emperor Leopold (August 27, 1791). The Constituent Assembly knowing how impossible it was for the spirit of sacrifice—which had shone so brightly on the night of August 4—to become a rule of conduct for all those whom the Revolution had harmed, refused to enter into extraordinary legislation. It threatened but did not act. The legislature acted. All unconstitutional priests were deprived of their salaries; emigrants who did not return by a certain date

[1] The leaders of the Republicans were called *Montagnards*, mountaineers, because in the meetings of the assembly they occupied seats high up on the left of the hall.

[2] The *Girondins* were so called because they numbered in their ranks the deputies of Gironde, Vergniaud, Gaudet, and Gensonné, men who were famous for their brilliant eloquence, and so gave the name of their province to the party they adorned.

were declared to be conspirators and the income of their property was added to the national revenue, but without prejudicing the rights of their wives, their children, or their *bona-fide* creditors.

Declaration to Foreign Powers.—As to the foreign powers, the assembly authorised the king to reply to them in these terms: "Say to them that where preparations against France are suffered to proceed France sees only enemies to herself; say that we will stand firmly by our oath to make no further conquest; that we offer the security of good neighbours, the inviolable friendship of a free and powerful country; that we will respect their laws, their customs, their constitutions, but that we wish ours also to be respected. Say to them finally that if the German princes persist in their preparations against France, France will raise against them not only blood and iron but the principle of liberty. It is for them to calculate what may be the results of this reawakening of nations" (November 29, 1791). The king transmitted requests to the foreign powers that they should withdraw their troops from the frontiers of France; but they declared through M. de Kaunitz "the legitimacy of the league of sovereigns, united to ensure the safety and honour of crowns." It could therefore be no longer doubted that the foreign powers had formed a coalition against France and were about to begin that terrible war which lasted for twenty-three years; which was for them one long tale of disaster, which deflected the Revolution from its peaceful courses, which covered France with glory indeed, but also with blood.

The Girondin Ministry (March, 1792).—At the approach of war Louis XVI. was obliged to call the *Girondin* party to the ministry; Servan went to the War Office; Dumouriez to the Foreign Office. The latter, an extremely able man, full of resource, had unfortunately lived for fifty years among the intrigues of courts and was devoid of principle, but for the time being he was a *Girondin*. The portfolio of the Interior was given to Roland, an honest man, whose wife deserved her place among the great names of the Revolution. When Roland came to court for the first time he came in a round hat and with ribbons on his shoes. The master of ceremonies could not believe his eyes. He did not want to allow Roland to proceed, but could not prevent a minister from passing. He turned to Dumouriez, "O sir! no buckles on his shoes!" cried the guardian of etiquette in despair. "Ah, monsieur," replied Dumouriez gravely, "then all is indeed lost!"

First Reverse: June 29, 1792.—On April 20, 1792, Louis XVI.

solemnly declared war on the emperor. Dumouriez wished to take the offensive. He counted on carrying the Low Countries with him, as they had recently been in revolt against the house of Austria. But the start was unfortunate. As there was no confidence between the soldiers and their officers, the first always feared the treason of the second. Two army corps took to flight, one of them put Dillon, the general in command, to death. Paris was terrified. The assembly announced that the country was in danger and voted the formation of a camp of 20,000 men in the capital; it also pronounced the penalty of deportation against unconstitutional priests. The king refused to sanction this last measure and dismissed his Girondist ministry. Vergniaud attacked him in the chamber, giving it to be understood that the king favoured the progress of the Austrians. With the assent of eighty-three departments the assembly sent the king a severe letter from Roland, showing clearly that all the difficulties of the situation arose from the reciprocal defiance between the king and the assembly. At this moment Louis could still have saved his crown by putting himself at the head of the Revolution. Far from that, he sent a secret agent, Mallet du Pan, to the foreign coalition. This mission was ignored. But no one doubted that the "Austrian Committee" formed round the queen corresponded with the enemies. Pétion was Mayor of Paris. He was a republican and allowed the most violent movements against the monarchy to emanate from the Hôtel de Ville. These movements, exaggerated by the clubs, were made known among the people by the powerful agency of the press, especially by Marat's paper, which began its sanguinary dictatorship and disorganised everything by sowing suspicion broadcast. The people did not long resist this appeal, which appeared to be justified by the menaces of the emigrants and the insufficient measures taken for the defence of the country.

On June 20 the people, armed with pikes, assembled under pretext of celebrating the anniversary of the Oath of the Tennis Court, and, led by Santerre the brewer, advanced towards the assembly, which made the mistake of opening its doors and letting the crowd pass in front of it singing the famous *Ça ira*[1] to the cries of *Vive la nation!* The crowd then marched to the Tuileries, forced an entrance, and summoned Louis XVI. to sanction certain decrees. The king, hemmed in to a narrow

[1] The chorus of a republican song, famous in France in those revolutionary days.

space in front of a window, was nearly stifled. He got up on a table and allowed the red cap adopted by the Jacobins to be put on his head. The people were satisfied; they went away without even having obtained the sanction of their decrees. Louis showed noble courage on that fatal day which inaugurated the reign of force. La Fayette, who commanded one of the armies on the frontier, in vain demanded retribution for this violation of the royal residence. Two months later he was an outlaw. He was forced to leave his army, to leave France. He was the last hope of the constitutionalists: his flight announced the triumph of the republicans.

Manifesto of the Duke of Brunswick: August 10, 1792.—The whole of France was stirred up. The deputies from the departments hastened to Paris to form the camp; the most important, those from Marseilles, stayed in the capital, to which they brought the famous song since called after them. The leaders of the *Cordeliers* and *Jacobins*, Danton, Marat, and Robespierre, took advantage of their presence to deliver a final blow to the monarchy. The first imprudence of the allies gave them their opportunity. On July 26, 1792, the Duke of Brunswick, general of the Prussian army, published a manifesto, announcing that he was about to give back to Louis XVI., in the name of the other sovereigns, his former powers. He threatened to treat those towns which dared to defend themselves as rebels, to shoot those of the inhabitants who took up arms, and, should the Tuileries be insulted, to deliver Paris over to military execution. The challenge was accepted. A petition signed by the sections (August 9) demanded that the king should finally give up his rights before the close of the day or his castle would be attacked. In a moment the tocsin sounded; a warning shot was fired; the people of St. Marceau and St. Antoine assembled, and in the morning, well provided with cannon, muskets, and cartridges, and accompanied by many companies of the National Guard, they surrounded the Tuileries. Louis XVI., guarded by Swiss soldiers, nobles, and some of the National Guard, was able to offer defence. But the National Guard went over to the people, the assassination of Mandat, the energetic commander, disorganised the resistance, and the king decided to leave before the attack commenced (7 a.m.). He took refuge in the National Assembly with all his family, not without danger; and as the assembly could not legally continue its deliberations in the presence of the king, he was given a place of refuge in the stenographers' room, where he stayed for two days. Contradictory

orders paralysed the ardour of the Swiss and the nobles left in the castle, which after a short and sanguinary fight was taken and sacked. Its defenders were put to death where they stood, in the rooms, in the garden, in the neighbouring streets ; 2000 persons perished. The victors went in procession to the assembly and dictated to it two orders: that the king should forfeit all his rights and that a national convention should be convoked. The assembly obeyed the second order ; it left the heavy responsibility of the first to its successors and contented itself with suspending executive power. The insurrection was thus a fresh victory for the people, who were becoming used to substitute blows for the regular procedure of institutions, a habit which cost France twenty revolutions in eighty years. England proceeded differently. Since 1688 in place of bloody insurrections she had only frequent changes in the ministry : every one, high or low, respected the law, everything depended on debate, nothing on force. Louis XVI. left the assembly to be conducted to the prison of the Temple. The commune, an unscrupulous body, became the ruling power ; Danton, Minister of Justice, the Mirabeau of the people, was at its head. Danton changed his energy into fury.

Capture of Longwy and Verdun: The Massacres of September (1792).—The Prussians hoped to take Longwy ; it was rumoured that they were already in Verdun, that they had crossed the Meuse, that they were sweeping over Champagne. The assembly proposed that the French should retire beyond the Loire. Danton expostulated that to give up Paris was to give up France. Just as he spoke the report of cannon was heard. "That shot is not a warning," he cried, "it is the sound of a charge against the enemies of France. What do we require in order to vanquish them? Audacity; more audacity; always audacity!" But Danton pushed audacity to the point of crime. He thought that before setting out to vanquish external enemies it was necessary to exterminate those within, at least to frighten the royalists. It was for that reason that he gave orders, or at least allowed orders to be given by the committee in charge—of which Marat was a member—for the frightful massacres of the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th September, massacres which filled all the prisons of Paris with blood. A body of four or five hundred assassins in the pay of the commune seized the prisons. Some of these murderers constituted themselves as tribunals, others served as executioners. The prisoners were called in the order registered in the jailers' books ; after a few questions they were either set

free with a cry of *Vive la nation*, or they were conducted to the prison yard and there despatched by blows from sabres, pikes, hatchets, or clubs. There was no mercy shown to unconstitutional priests, to the Swiss, the bodyguard, or to any avowed royalists. The Princess de Lamballe, a friend of the queen, was torn to pieces ; her head was carried through the streets, even below the windows of the Temple prison where the king and queen were confined. After having killed the political prisoners, the assassins proceeded to put the others to death also ; the women of the Salpetrière ; the paupers, the lunatics, and the children of the Bicêtre. The number killed came to 966. There were victims also at Reims, at Meaux, at Lyons, at Orleans ; forty-six were put to death at Versailles. The assembly, terrified and powerless, had no means of stopping these massacres. The revolution, begun in the name of justice and fraternity, had allowed itself to be stamped by the ineffaceable stains of blood.

Victory of Valmy (September 30, 1792).—But the courage of the French soldiers helps us to turn from these abominable outrages to one of the greatest victories in all the long wars of France. Only a few days after the massacre, Dumouriez, at the head of a new French army, gained the victory of Valmy. One hundred and sixty thousand Prussian and imperial troops had left Coblentz on July 20, divided into several army corps. To oppose them, France had only 96,000 undisciplined men, without confidence in themselves or their leaders, and who, it must be allowed—for good and seasoned armies cannot be improvised—could never have prevented the enemy from penetrating even as far as Paris had the enemy been astute, his progress rapid. On August 22, the enemy was only at Longwy, which it seized ; Verdun was the next to fall. The commander, Beaurepaire, wished to defend the town. The municipal council opposed him. " I have sworn," cried Beaurepaire, " to save the town or to die. I will keep my oath! " He drew his pistol and shot himself through the brain in the council chamber (September 2). One of the soldiers also refused to capitulate. At the approach of the Prussians he fired his musket at them. Seized at once he was soon set free within bounds, when it became known that he was about to settle his own fate. He was a handsome young man, of determined air, calm and proud expression. Near his quarters there was a bridge over the Meuse ; he climbed up on the parapet, stood motionless for an instant, and then plunged into the depths. So he died. To such heights did the spirit of that age attain.

This heroic act might well have caused Brunswick to reflect. He had found France very different from what the emigrants had led him to expect, and as he had no strong position between his army and Paris, he hesitated to thrust himself among that infuriated people. He deployed his forces slowly behind the Meuse. During this time Dumouriez had hurried forward his troops and, pointing to the passes of the Argonne, said to his lieutenants, "There are the Thermopylaes of France." They occupied the passes and formed two camps in the rear, entrenched before Reims and Châlons, another at Meaux, in which the soldiers who hastened in from all quarters were drilled and organised. Two thousand voluntary soldiers arrived from Paris alone every day.

But one of the passes was forced; the way to Châlons was clear. Instead of taking refuge in that town, Dumouriez stayed persistently in the Argonne, a country easy of defence, to establish himself at need on the rear of the Prussians. The latter halted to give battle. Kellerman had rejoined the French. The principal effort was made round the rising ground of Valmy where Kellerman had taken up his position with his conscripts, described by the emigrants as "tailors and shoemakers." But it soon appeared that the smell of powder appealed to these shop assistants just as to seasoned soldiers. They stood fire with a coolness on which the enemy had not counted. The action was nothing more than a cannonade of a few hours. Bombs having set fire to some ammunition waggons among the French batteries, the resulting explosion killed and wounded a number of men and there was a moment of disorder. Brunswick made use of it to send forward his infantry in close order to the attack. Kellerman allowed them to come on to within a few yards without firing a shot, and then, putting himself at the head of his men with the shout of *Vive la nation!* re-echoed by the whole line, he rushed them forward on the enemy in a bayonet charge. This tremendous battle cry, which lasted for several minutes, coupled with the proud and determined bearing of the French, arrested the Prussians; Dumouriez's cannon battered the flank of their column; they fell back quickly and Brunswick withdrew from action.

On the morrow of Valmy the convention met and proclaimed the republic. Its reply to the negotiations proposed by Brunswick was worthy of the ancient senate of Rome: "The French republic cannot enter into any negotiations until the Prussian troops have completely evacuated the territory of

France." The Prussians, whose ranks were cruelly thinned by want and disease, began on the 1st of October to withdraw from France.

Defence of Lille: Victory of Jemappes.—While Dumouriez held up the invading army at Valmy and even forced it to gradual retreat, Custine had taken the offensive on the Rhine; he took Speyer, Worms, and even the great town of Mainz. In the Alps, Montesquieu conquered Savoy and Anselm, the Count of Nice. In the Low Countries the Austrians attacked Lille with savage barbarism: for six days they threw bombs and red-hot cannon balls into the town; 450 houses were burned to the ground, 700 or 800 were damaged; but still the Austrians could not vanquish the constancy of the patriotic city (September 20 to October 7). Some one on the ramparts told an artillery man that his house was in flames. "My place is here," he replied, "shot for shot!" and he continued to serve his piece. Dumouriez arrived with the victorious army of Valmy to avenge this useless cruelty. He won the battle of Jemappes (November 6) which gave the Low Countries to France. On November 13 he entered Brussels. One of his lieutenants at Valmy and at Jemappes was the son of the Duke of Orleans: he afterwards became Louis Philippe.

And so in her first campaign the new France, formed under the fire of her young soldiers, repulsed the attacks of kings and laid her hand on territory already half French, which even Louis XIV. had been unable to take.

Goethe, the great German poet, had been in the Prussian army at Valmy, not as a soldier, but as a spectator. For the coalition had not expected a great battle, it was rather a march on Paris they contemplated, a rapid journey, finishing in a triumphal entry. Their presumptuous confidence was shaken, the cannon of Valmy dissipated such ideas. One evening in the camp the poet was asked to dispel with his usual verve the sinister presentiments which were already making themselves felt. But he restrained himself; he remained silent for a long time. When at last he did speak his voice was grave and solemn: he said only these words: "A new era in the history of the world begins from this time."

CHAPTER LXI

THE CONVENTION

National Convention.—The monarchy succumbed on August 10. The convention had only to write down in laws that which already existed in deeds; its first act was to proclaim the republic. But the conquerors were divided among themselves; two great parties disputed the direction of the assembly: the *Girondins*, who were formerly the strongest party in the legislature, and the *Montagnards*, who were to be the dominating power in the convention. The first were apt to be carried away by their eloquence and knowledge; the second were bolder and more passionate. Brought up on the ideas of Jean Jacques Rousseau they dreamt for the France of the eighteenth century of the rude virtues of the golden age of Rome and Sparta; even though society should perish under their attempts, they were determined to apply their theories to it. Between the *Girondins* and the *Montagnards* (the latter represented particularly the interests and passions of the *bourgeoisie* and the people) was the *Plaine*, composed of moderate but feeble men who formed the ineffectual part of the majority. That is unfortunately the lot of timid moderation in all public controversies.

Death of Louis XVI. (January 21, 1793).—From the 10th of August the royal family were confined in the Temple, a gloomy fortress of which the big tower served as their prison. The king occupied one story, the queen, Madame Elizabeth, the young dauphin, and his sister another. They met during the day. Breakfast was served at nine o'clock in the king's apartments. At ten the king began work with his son, the queen with her daughter. At one o'clock, if the day was fine, the family went into the grounds. The walk finished at two. Then dinner was served. The king took a short rest. After his sleep one of the party would read aloud. Then it was time for supper, after which the family separated. That was always a sad parting, because the farewells of any night might be the last. All communication with the outside world was strictly forbidden. Only one servant, Cléry, attended to their wants, without ever going outside the grounds; the prisoners had no means of hearing about what would indeed only have pained them—the deaths of their most faithful friends, the victories of the republic

which dispelled any hopes as to their own fate. Such, during five months, was the life of the royal family at the Temple. Louis XVI., who was better fitted for private life than for the throne, showed a calmness and courage during this captivity which often touched even the most severe of his gaolers.

The constitution declared the king inviolable and authorised no further proceedings against him than the forfeiture of his rights. The forfeiture was already pronounced; the law had therefore been carried out. But the country was in a position of extreme danger. England threatened, Austria was about to make greater efforts, a coalition of the whole of Europe was imminent. There seemed to be an outbreak of danger on every side, those who were not restrained by an inflexible morality became excited, lost their heads, and ruined themselves at the thought of impending disaster. Danton uttered these sinister words in the assembly, speaking of the coalition: "Throw them the head of the king in defiance." And the convention, making itself both accuser and judge, cited the king to appear before it (December 3). The venerable Malesherbes, crowning a noble life by a noble deed, demanded and obtained the honour of defending his former master. Desèze, a young advocate, was the spokesman: "I look for judges among you," he cried. "I find only accusers!" St. Just and Robespierre accepted the situation put in this way. They did not trouble to find out whether the accusations against the king were false or true: they demanded his death as a measure of public safety. The Girondins made only timid efforts to save him.

Four questions had been successively put to the vote. (1) Is the king culpable of conspiracy against public liberty, of attempts against public safety? Yes, was the unanimous answer. (2) Did he make an appeal to the people? 276 out of 745 voted in the affirmative. (3) What penalty should be inflicted? 387 voted for unconditional death, 338 for detention or death on certain conditions, 28 were absent or abstained from voting. (4) Should there be any delay in carrying out the sentence? 310 voted for delay, 380 against it. The convention ordered that the execution should take place in twenty-four hours. On January 21st, 1793, Louis XVI., with courage and Christian resignation admired by posterity, mounted the scaffold. He wished to address a few words to the crowd: a roll of drums drowned his voice. And thus a prince who had wished sincerely the good of the people died by the hand of the people, the victim of a hatred even more implacable that that hatred considered itself

righteous. It had been thought that this royal head in its fall would have deepened the impassable abyss between the old France and the new ; it was less the monarch than the monarchy that had been decapitated. Carnot had wept in signing the arrest of the king. The fatal doctrine of the public safety counted in history one crime the more : for it had been once more forgotten that the true safety of a people lies not in executions but in noble hearts. The scaffold erected for Louis was not long removed. Many of his judges were to mount it ; a long trail of blood was still to flow behind the hearse which had carried the body of the king. It was a terrorist who said : " Only the dead return not." He deceived himself ; the best way to call them back is to place the martyr's crown on their heads.

First Coalition (1793–1797).—The death of Louis XVI. caused those states which had still hesitated to arm against France. All the crowned heads felt themselves attacked by this blow, for all were threatened by the revolutionary doctrine and propaganda now practised by the convention. On the proposition of Danton the convention had decreed that France should offer help and the hand of brotherhood to all peoples who wished to regain their liberty (November 19, 1792). The English had already shown themselves sympathetic to a Revolution which seemed similar to their own, though as a matter of fact it was entirely different. But Pitt drew England into the coalition and she offered fleets and subsidies to the enemies of France. Threatened on all frontiers, France did not recoil. On February 1, 1793, she sent England a declaration of war ; on March 9 she challenged Holland and Spain ; and on March 23 she received a declaration of war from the empire. Denmark and Sweden alone remained neutral. It was like a crusade of all the monarchies and aristocracies of Europe, not indeed to avenge Louis XVI., but to stifle the principles of the new social order given to the world by the Revolution.

Grave Dangers: Revolutionary Measures: The Terror.—In the western provinces the influence of those two orders whose privileges the Revolution had destroyed still reigned supreme. Unrest had commenced early. It spread little by little to Maine, Anjou, and Brittany, where the insurgents were known by the name of *Chouans*.[1] From October, 1791, it had been necessary to send troops against them. But the Vendean peasants did not

[1] So called from their first chief, Jean Cottereau, nicknamed the *Chouan* or *Chat-huant*. He was an old smuggler who had adopted for the rallying-call of his confederates the cry of the screech-owl or *Chat-huant*.

begin civil war in the name of the throne and the altar till after the death of the king and after the convention had decreed a levy of 300,000 men in March, 1793. Simultaneously with these internal dangers reverses took place abroad. The English had thrown themselves on the French colonies, and had seized Tobago and Pondicherry. Dumouriez, beaten at Neerwinden after an unsuccessful invasion of Holland, evacuated Belgium and declared himself opposed to the convention. His men refused to follow him: he was obliged to seek refuge in the Austrian camp (April 3). The republic had lost its best general. He was the second who had abandoned his troops. By this time nearly all the officers belonging to the nobility had emigrated. The soldiers took up their former defiant attitude against their leaders: the army had disorganised itself yet again and the northern frontier was in danger.

The convention ruled everything. A *Committee of General Security* was formed to militate against the enemy within the gates, to seek out not only the guilty but the suspects; a revolutionary tribunal was established to punish them. A *Committee of Public Safety*, a dictatorship of nine members, regulated public authority after a despotic manner in order to give to national defence the most energetic activity (April 6). From fear that the inviolability of members of assembly would hamper this new power, the convention renounced that privilege. Since the defection of Dumouriez suspicion was rife everywhere: Robespierre firmly believed that the *Girondins* wished to divide France and open it up to foreigners; the *Girondins* believed that Marat, Robespierre, and Danton wished to make the Duke of Orleans king, then to assassinate him, and form a triumvirate, from which Danton would achieve the overthrow of his colleagues in order to reign supreme. Every one believed in the absurd plans of his adversaries. And beyond all this there was defiance; fear, that terrible counsellor; the hatchet suspended and falling on all heads. This period had a name, the Reign of Terror: terror among the executioners—for that reason the more pitiless—as well as among the victims.

Proscription of the Girondins (June 2, 1793): Rising in the Provinces.—The decree which annulled the inviolability of the deputies was soon put into practice. Since the case of the king, the *Girondins* and the *Montagnards* waged violent warfare against each other in the convention; one side wished to put a stop to the revolution, the other, having chosen that course, wished the revolution to travel only by blood-stained paths. The most

ferocious of those bloodthirsty men was the frightful Marat, who reasoned thus: "Public safety is the supreme law; well, there are 270,000 nobles and priests with their partisans, who are a danger to the state: therefore those 270,000 heads must fall." Every morning he would make this demand. Carrying the cynicism of his thought even into his dress, he would come to the meetings of the convention in *sabots*, the red cap of the Jacobins on his head, and wearing the carmagnole.[1] The *Girondins*, whom he accused of moderation, attacked him. They succeeded in securing an accusation against him and he was sent before the revolutionary tribunal. This tribunal, which judged without appeal, which inflicted the death sentence for one word, for a regret, sometimes even for the very name of the accused, absolved Marat and released him. The populace escorted him back in triumph to the convention.

This attack was a double imprudence, for it was the first blow at the inviolability of the deputies and it showed the weakness of the *Girondins*. Danton could have saved them, and wished to do so, but he had the blood of the 2nd of September on his hands; they refused his help, and he in his turn attacked them on May 31 and again more violently on June 2. La Montaigne, who had been made head of the sections of Paris by the commune, armed them against the convention. Surrounded, terrified, the convention voted, under pressure of the insurrection, for the arrest of thirty-one *Girondins*. Some of them like Vergniaud and Gensonné awaited their sentences; others, Pétion and Barbaroux, fled from their persecutors and endeavoured to raise insurrection in the departments. Caen, Bordeaux, Lyons, Marseilles, and most of the southern towns declared against the convention; the peasants of the Cevennes hoisted the white flag, like the peasants of La Vendée; Toulon was given up to the English with the whole Mediterranean fleet (August 27). Paoli wished also to give them Corsica. Condé and Valenciennes were taken by the Austrians (July); in the south, the Spaniards invaded Roussillon. At the same time another enemy in the shape of widespread famine assisted in the general internal disorganisation.

Energetic Measures of Defence.—The cause of the revolution seemed lost; the convention saved it by its extraordinary energy. Against the famine she decreed the *maximum*, that is

[1] The *Carmagnole* was a dance and song popular in France in the republican year 1793. A peculiar shape of jacket worn by the people at that time came to be so-called.

to say, a tariff for provisions (September). Severe measures were taken against monopolists and agitators; the merchants were obliged to provision their shops and to sell their goods, whether it entailed profit or loss. On August 1, 1793, the importation of English goods was prohibited. Thus commercial liberty was at an end; since the proclamation of the republic there had been neither political nor individual liberty. The whole country was put in a state of siege, submitting to the dictatorship of the Committee of Public Safety. Merlin revised the law of suspects which threw more than 300,000 people into prison, and Barrère said in the name of the Committee of Public Safety: "The republic is nothing but one great besieged town; France is one vast camp. Men of every age are called by the country to the defence of liberty: the young men will fight; the married men will forge arms: the women will make clothes and tents for the soldiers: the children will tear up old linen for bandages: and the old people will have themselves carried to the public squares where they will stir up and inflame the courage of the nation." One million two hundred thousand men were raised. In a few months Carnot organised fourteen armies. Powder and steel were wanting; the chemists supplied them. There were no cannon; Fourcroy melted down the church bells and found the necessary copper. Bordeaux and Lyons returned to the path of duty, Lyons after thirty days' resistance. Bonaparte, then a captain of artillery, retook Toulon (December 19); the Vendeans were driven from the gates of Nantes (June 29); and Jourdan, at the head of the principal army, held the coalition.

Permanence of the Guillotine.—But terrible scenes were going forward in the interior. Nobles and priests, condemned as suspects, perished in multitudes on the scaffolds erected in all the towns; a revolutionary army, dragging a guillotine behind it, visited all the departments. The most dreadful and bloody deeds that history has ever recorded were surpassed by Carrier, the execrable inventor of the *Noyades*[1] of Nantes; by Collot d'Herbois, Couthon, and Fouché who bombarded Lyons with grape-shot; by Barras and Fréron at Toulon; by Lebon at Arras. A heroic young woman, Charlotte Corday, thought that in killing Marat she would end the terror (July 14). But this murder only made it the more ruthless. The queen, Marie Antoinette, her sister the pious Madame Elizabeth, Bailly himself—all were executed in the *Champ de Mars* with the

[1] *Noyades*, drownings at Nantes during the Revolution. Vessels were scuttled in order to drown those on board.

utmost refinement of cruelty; the *Girondins* (October 31) and the Duke of Orleans; the Generals Custine, Biron, Houchard; Madame Roland, the famous chemist Lavoisier, Malesherbes, and thousands of other illustrious heads fell. Cartloads of victims, without distinction of age or condition, succeeded each other day by day at the foot of the scaffolds erected in the *Place de la Concorde*, at the gate of *St. Antoine*, and in the circular space of the *barrière du Trone*.

Execution of the Herbertists and Dantonists (March and April, 1794).—The *Montagnards* had come to disagree among themselves. The most violent, the *Herbertists*, all powerful in the commune, had an official paper called the *Le Père Duchêne*. They aspired to make the Terror the regular government of France; they professed atheism and had a bust of the goddess Reason placed on the altar of Notre-Dame. The Dantonists were as yet known only as the *indulgents*. Their leaders, Danton and Camille Desmoulins, editor of the *Vieux Cordelier*, attacked at the same time the anarchists of the *Herbertist* party and the *Committee of Public Safety*, whose tyranny they reproached with real eloquence. Robespierre, who with Couthon and St. Just had the ruling power in the committee, denounced the *Herbertists*, whom he accused of corrupting the nation by propagating atheism and of conspiring with foreigners. They were executed (March 24, 1794); twelve days later Danton, Desmoulins, and those who were called the *moderates* suffered the same fate, under accusation of favouring the elevation of the Duke of Orleans to the throne (April, 1794).

The 9th Thermidor.[1]—Robespierre, in his turn, dreamt of arresting the revolution, in order to reconstruct on the bloody ruins of the past a society after his own mind. He caused Carrier to be recalled, threatened those who were most deeply implicated in sanguinary excesses, and took under his protection the representatives of the law as well as certain nobles and priests. The committees received these signs of an approaching dictatorship with dismay. Collot d'Herbois and Billaud-Varennes united with Tallien, Bourdon de l'Oise, Barras, and Fouché, and engaged indirectly in a struggle on the subject of the Festival of the Supreme Being, celebrated by Robespierre with a theatrical effect and a pomp which brought him blatantly into prominence. Robespierre then made Couthon propose, in the revolutionary tribunal, a law to facilitate judicial murders, which placed pro-

[1] The Thermidor was part of July and August, the eleventh month of the republican year. See end of this chapter.

cedure entirely in the background and held the knife over the convention. He thought by that means to tie the hands of his adversaries. This dreadful law, proposed on the 2nd Prairial,[1] was adopted, but with such modifications that the designs of its author miscarried. The force of Robespierre was enormous, his honesty could not be doubted, and no one dared to utter the word tyrant. It was hoped to attain his downfall by ridicule. The Committee of Public Safety went about its business in the face of a set of fanatics who revered in Robespierre a sort of Messiah. Then he isolated himself from the government and returned to the Jacobin Club, waiting for an opportunity to strike a decisive blow. But the effects of the Prairial law made themselves felt; the Terror redoubled. In forty-seven days, from June 10th to July 27th, 1400 persons perished, among them all the parliament of Toulouse, the Marshals de Noailles and de Mouchy, the poets André Chénier and Roucher, General Beauharnais, many women, and one child of sixteen.

Such a terrible state of things could not go on. A cry of public compassion arose against the authors of these abominations, above all against Robespierre, who still controlled everything although he no longer appeared at the Committee of Public Safety. His enemies exploited this movement of public opinion; they accused him of aspiring to the dictatorship, of meditating a new 31st of May against the assembly, and they circulated immense lists of proscriptions, drawn up, it was said, by him. On the 8th Thermidor the struggle broke out in the convention. Robespierre tired the assembly with an interminable apology and irritated it by threats. He demanded that the whole government should be reconstructed and the traitors punished. He designated as traitors most of the members of committees, even Carnot and Cambon who had saved the republic by organising the finances and the war. The debate became heated and was for some time indecisive. The defection of Barrère, "the man who always comes to the help of the strongest side," implied that of the *Plaine;* the assembly refused to vote on its impression of Robespierre's speech. He went straight to the Jacobins who swore to defend him and the commune prepared an insurrection for the following day. On the 9th the struggle recommenced in the convention. Robespierre was ultimately accused along with Couthon and St. Just. His brother and Lebas wished to be associated with them. They were all arrested and taken to

[1] The Prairial was the third spring month of the republican year and extended from May 20 till June 19. See end of this chapter.

various prisons. But the commune had the tocsin sounded in the *faubourgs*, the crowd gathered and rescued the prisoners, whom they took in triumph to the Hôtel de Ville.

Open war broke out between those two rival powers, the representatives of Paris and the representatives of France. The convention acted with vigour and resolution. It outlawed Robespierre and all his followers; it called sections of the National Guard to defend it and marched with imposing forces to the Hôtel de Ville to recapture the condemned men. Lebas blew out his brains. Robespierre the younger threw himself out of a window, but was not killed. His brother had his jaw broken by a shot fired by a gendarme. All were conducted to the scaffold through the affronts and outrages of a crowd who saw in their execution the end of a terrible administration (9th and 10th Thermidor: July 27th and 28th, 1794). Henriot, Coffinhal, and twenty representatives were sent that day or the next, without discussion, without judgment, to the scaffold. It was a fitting conclusion to the Reign of Terror. In the 420 days it had lasted, 2669 condemnations had been pronounced and executed by the revolutionary tribunal. But the victims of Couthon, of Collet d'Herbois at Lyons, of Lebon at Arras, of Carrier at Nantes, of Fréron at Toulon and Marseilles, of Tallien at Bordeaux—the victims of these men can never be counted.

Abolition of Revolutionary Laws.—Some of those who had accomplished the downfall of Robespierre were the very men who had pushed the Terror to extremes. But such was the force of public opinion that they were constrained to appear as if they had striven only for moderation. "The whole nation cried that the day of tyranny was over, and this belief put an end to it." The fate of Robespierre became the signal for reaction, which in spite of its excesses allowed France to breathe again. The guillotine ceased to be the chief means of government, and even although it was not proscribed for long afterwards, at least the people were not called upon to view every day the hideous spectacle of thirty or forty heads falling under the knife.

The whole jurisdiction of the government relaxed. The importance of the Committees of Public Safety and General Security was considerably lessened; the Prairial law was repealed; the prisons were opened, in Paris alone 10,000 captives being released. The convention took over the powers of the commune which had for so long neutralised or dominated the assembly. The Jacobin Club, the last refuge of the conquered party, was closed, to the applause of the whole country. Carrier and the rest of those re-

sponsible for the massacres were sent to execution. Lebon and Fouquier-Tinville, the public accuser, were not put to death till the following year. Collet d'Herbois, Barrère, Billaud-Varennes, and Vadier were deported to Cayenne, after a last effort on the part of the Jacobins (May 20, 1795). On that day, the public having invaded the hall of the commune, Féraud, the deputy, was killed. Boissy d'Anglas presided. He was presented with Féraud's head stuck on a pike. He lifted his hat, bowed, and by his coolness and dignity quelled the passions of the mob. After that incident the *faubourg* of St. Antoine was disarmed.

Glorious Campaign of 1793.—The glory of her arms had consoled France in her mourning. Carnot, of the Committee of Public Safety, organised the victory, sending to the armies the plans which the soldiers carried out. The strategists of the coalition had been able to think of no other course than that of surrounding France by numerous armies, broken up into a multitude of smaller bodies. If they took one step forward on the territory of France, it was after making very sure that nothing threatened them in the rear. For these slow and methodical operations, for this war of sieges and positions, Carnot substituted a war of large forces. Instead of these big and studied manœuvres which the improvised French generals understood little better than the conscripts—who did not understand them at all—he ordered rapid blows, rapid advances with the bayonet, without considering the forces of the enemy ; that the fight and the victory should be carried out at the rate of a charge. These tactics, admirably suited to the inexperience and the enthusiasm of the young armies of France, were also the best for breaking through the long but slender cordon which the coalition had drawn round France : they were successful. At the end of August, 1793, France was invaded on all fronts and might well have given way to despair ; at the end of December she was everywhere victorious.

Loss of Condé, Valenciennes, and Mainz (May–August).—After the defection of Dumouriez the coalition—instead of marching altogether on Paris to stifle the revolution, which they declared to be their sole aim—thought of nothing but their individual interests. The English sought to lay hands on Dunkirk, a town of which they had long been covetous ; the Austrians wished to unite the fortresses of the Scheldt to their Belgian provinces. Dampierre, who had taken refuge in Famar's camp at Valenciennes, was killed on May 9th in trying to raise the blockade of Condé ; on the 23rd the Austrians forced Famar's camp and the army

retired under Bouchain to the camp of César. Condé and Valenciennes were invested. From the month of April Custine, retreating till he came under the guns of Wissembourg—as rashly as he had before advanced as far as Frankfort—had allowed the Prussians to surround Mainz. Twenty thousand picked French soldiers were there; with them Kleber and two men of indomitable courage, Rewbel and Merlin of Thionville. Beauharnais, the successor of Custine, could do nothing more to save Mainz. The coalition spent three months, May, June, and July, in these three sieges. The towns finally surrendered through famine. But during these three months the whole of France was in arms; her energetic means of defence were in proportion to her peril.

The coalition lost another month in preparing for further operations. On the Rhine they proceeded from Mainz towards the Lauter and the Saar, which cover Alsace and Lorraine. In the north they separated; the English marched on Dunkirk and the Austrians undertook a new siege, that of Quesnoy. Houchard, with orders to operate against the English, had received a splendid plan of action from Carnot. While Souham and Hoche were energetically defending Dunkirk, Houchard was to advance in force against the besieging army and its covering army, to crush them, one after the other. He defeated the English at Handschoote (September 8). But it was only a partial victory, because he carried out only half the order he had received from the committee. He had conducted his advance and his attack in such a way that he had driven the covering army back on the besieging army instead of separating them. Five days later he beat the Dutch and drove them from Menin; but a panic breaking out in his own army sent it in disorder to Lille. Houchard was deposed and sent, like Custine, to the scaffold. The coalition had stranded themselves on their extreme right, towards Dunkirk; they had succeeded on their left, where they had taken Quesnoy. Masters of the Scheldt, through the capture of Condé and Valenciennes, and of the space between the Scheldt and the Sambre by the capture of Quesnoy and Mons, they wished now to take Maubeuge in order to command the higher reaches of the Sambre. It was practically the same position as that of Prince Eugène in 1712. France seemed in some danger; it was happily dispelled. Instead of attacking on the left, like Villars, Carnot ordered action on the right, along the Sambre. Jourdan, who had only been in command of a battalion at the beginning of the campaign, had been promised the command of the northern army; he vanquished the Prince

of Coburg at Watignies before Maubeuge and raised the siege of that town (October 15 and 16). France made no further advances on that side, but three important towns were saved.

In the Vosges the armies of the Rhine and the Moselle lost the Battle of Pirmasens (September 14), also the lines of Wissembourg which Wurmser forced on October 13; Landau was bombarded. But Hoche, fresh from his successes in the defence of Dunkirk, had been given command of the army on the Moselle; Pichegru was at the head of the army on the Rhine, and the representatives St. Just and Lebas came to animate by their energy both the troops and the populace. Carnot had decreed that the army of the Moselle should try to regain the chain of the Vosges, to command the passes on both sides, and be able to unite with the army of the Rhine. Brunswick helped in the success of this plan by retreating, after a vain attempt on Bitche, as far as Kaiserslautern in the latitude of Mannheim; while Wurmser, on the other side of the Vosges, stopped almost in sight of Strasburg. Hoche was held up at Kaiserslautern against the Prussians (November 17), but suddenly drew off his troops to cross the Vosges on the right flank of the Austrians, while Pichegru attacked their front. Hoche recaptured the lines of Wissembourg (December 27) and forced the Austrians across the Rhine, while the Prussians, uncovered on their left, retreated within reach of the cannon of Mainz. Hoche spent the winter in an enemy country, the Palatinate.

In Italy the French and the Piedmontese disputed the chain of the Alps. The French were at Nice, their opponents at Saorgio, and the French had been beaten in trying to take that position. Towards the Pyrenees the Spaniards under Ricardos also kept the offensive; the republican army, after many and, for the most part, successful engagements, retired on Perpignan (December).

Success and Defeat of the Vendeans (1793).—But at this juncture civil war broke out. The republicans had recaptured Lyons (October 9) and Toulon (December 19); the one half ruined, the other pillaged by the English, who set fire to the arsenal, the dockyards, and those ships which they could not take away. Vendée resisted longer. In Brittany and Maine the *chouans* only offered a war of partisans and ambuscades: the peasants of lower Poitou made war on a large scale. The movement began at St. Florent, a little town of Loire on the left bank of the river of that name, below Angers. On March 10, 1793,

the young men of the canton were called up in obedience to a law which demanded a levy of 300,000 men. They went, but determined not to obey orders ; they mutinied, drove away the police, and sacked the Hôtel de Ville. That accomplished, they peacefully returned home. But a carrier named Cathelineau represented to them that the convention would be sure to take vengeance on them. They decided to follow him ; they ran from village to village, sounded the tocsin, collected the men who were willing to come, and carrying away with them posts, arms, and cannon, they took first the little town of Chemillé. Stofflet, one of the gamekeepers of the Count of Maulevrier, who, like his master, sympathised with the rebellion, joined him with those men who had followed him, and together they took possession of Chollet. It was no longer a peasant rising : it was an army, the country gentlemen at its head. Led by Lescure, Bonchamps, d'Elbée, La Rochejacquelein, and Charette, who did not disdain to associate with the plebeian leaders, the Vendeans took Saumur (June 29), and in order to make an opening at two points towards the sea—that is to say, towards emigration and towards the English—they attacked Les Sables and Nantes. Boulard saved the first, Canclaux the second, and Cathelineau was killed in the last attack (June 9), but the Vendeans still remained masters of their own department and drove out the republicans in two victories : in the south, that of Châtillon (July 3), where they carried the day against Westermann, who, coming from Parthenay, ventured rashly right into the midst of the insurrectionists ; and in the north, that of Vihiers (July 18), a victory over the army that had come from Angers.

The force in the west was now the only menace : 40,000 Vendeans marched on Luçon, where General Tuncq had only 6000 men. But the Vendeans, accepting battle in the plain, were utterly defeated (August 14). On September 5 they took their revenge at Chantonnay, in spite of Marceau's courage. Then the *Mayencais*, who for a year had been held up at Mainz unable to serve against the coalition, arrived in Vendée, with them Kleber, who was himself worth an army. The republican forces were divided into four bodies and it was decided to set out on the same day from Saumur, Nantes, Les Sables, and Niort, in order to come between the Vendeans and the sea, where an English fleet was now in sight, and to throw the Vendeans back from Marais on the Bocage. But the fact that both Canclaux and Rossignol had equality of command prevented unity of purpose ; counter-orders imprudently given stopped the march

of three divisions and left that of Canclaux exposed by itself to the onslaughts of the enemy. Twenty thousand Vendeans attacked his advance-guard at Torfou. It consisted of 2000 *Mayencais* and Kleber: they gave way under superiority of numbers and retreated. Kleber, to stop the enemy from crossing a bridge, left an officer and some men there saying, "My friends, you will be killed here," and his prophecy was fulfilled. On the same day the force of Angers lost the Ponts-de-Cé; that veteran soldier, Santerre, with the force of Saumur, was defeated at Coron. Another reverse at the same time at Montaigu obliged Canclaux to fall back on Nantes.

But the convention ordered its generals to finish the war by the 20th of October. In eleven days the Vendeans experienced four defeats; at St. Symphorien on October 6 by the *Mayencais*: at Châtillon on the 15th by Marceau and Kleber. Kleber finally crushed them before Chollet (October 17); d'Elbée and Bonchamp were killed; the latter before expiring obtained mercy for 4000 republican prisoners whom his men intended to shoot. Driven to the last extremity on the Loire by this great disaster, 80,000 Vendeans, men, women, children, and old people, crossed the river at Varades, to stir up risings in Anjou, Maine, and Brittany: they defeated the *bleus* (republicans) near Laval (October 27) and penetrated as far as Granville, where they expected to meet the English. But Granville repulsed them: they returned to Angers (December 3) to re-enter the Vendean Bocage. By this time the Loire was strongly guarded; they were thrown back on Mans, overwhelmed in that town (December 13), and utterly defeated at Savenay (December 25). Such was the end of this great war. The *colonnes infernales* were only isolated battles fought in La Vendée, where Charette, La Rochejacquelein, and Stofflet still held out.

Summer Campaign of 1794 : Fleurus.—The honour of the success gained in Alsace at the end of 1793 had been attributed to Hoche; Pichegru claimed it for himself and having persuaded St. Just to his way of thinking, the latter had Hoche imprisoned and gave to Pichegru the command of the northern army. That general lost two months in sanguinary but unsuccessful efforts on the Scheldt and the Sambre, and had himself no credit for the victories of Moucraen on April 29 and that of Turcoing on May 18—victories gained by the impetuous dash of the young French conscripts rather than by the ability of their chief. Happily Carnot relinquished in time the idea of a frontal attack on the enemy, who had taken Landrecies. Carnot thought to

threaten the enemy's lines of communication and retreat by recalling Jourdan with 45,000 men from the Moselle to the Sambre. The representatives St. Just and Lebas crossed the Sambre four times at the head of the republican army: four times they were repulsed. It was necessary at all costs to take Charleroi. Jourdan was persuaded to attempt the passage for the fifth time. He succeeded: Charleroi capitulated and the Prince of Coburg, who came too late to its assistance, lost the Battle of Fleurus (June 28), which reopened the Low Countries to France. Pichegru pushed the English towards Holland, Jourdan forced the Austrians to retreat behind the Meuse. Dugommier, a man as capable as he was brave, forced the formidable camp of Boulou in the Pyrenees on to the Tech near Céret, where he took 140 guns (May 1); and Dumerbion, directed by Bonaparte, who commanded the artillery of the Alps, accomplished the defeat of the Piedmontese camp at Saorigio by taking the Col di Tenda (April 28). The gates of Italy and Spain were open, like those of the Low Countries.

Winter Campaign of 1794-1795: Conquest of the Low Countries: Invasion of Spain.—Winter arrested neither the operations nor the success of the French army. Jourdan defeated the Austrians on the Ourthe, on the Roër, and forced them over the Rhine, while the Prussians, who were operating in the Palatinate, were rendered open to attack and forced to follow the Austrian retreat. And so the four French armies of the North, of the Sambre and Meuse, of the Moselle and Rhine, were together on the borders of that river. The winter had come with terrible severity. The temperature was seventeen degrees below zero. The soldiers, clothed in rags, without pay, but sustained through all their sufferings by unconquerable moral energy, instead of establishing themselves in camps, marched forward, pushing before them the English and the Dutch. On January 20, they entered Amsterdam. "This town, famous for its prosperity, witnessed with admiration ten battalions of French soldiers—without shoes, without stockings, wanting even the most indispensable garments, and forced to cover their nakedness with trusses of straw—enter triumphantly within its walls, to the sound of warlike music; they stacked their arms and bivouacked for some hours in the public square in the midst of ice and snow, waiting resignedly without murmuring till their needs could be attended to, till barracks could be found." Squadrons of hussars hurried to Texel to take the ice-bound Dutch fleet. Pichegru constituted Holland the Batavian republic. Thence he could command the

Prussian defences on the Rhine ; northern Germany was open to the soldiers of France and to her ideas.

Dugommier in the Eastern Pyrenees took Bellegarde, on the extremity of the French frontier, and forced the mountain pass which defended a line of seventy-seven redoubts (Battle of La Mouga, November 18). He himself perished in the hour of victory. Following on this success, Figuières, one of the strongholds of Europe, opened its gates. Moncey at the other end of the Pyrenees made simultaneously the capture of Guipuzcoa ; Spain was invaded on two sides. The Italian army was stationary.

Peace with Prussia and Spain, 1795: Quiberon.—Two powers were alarmed by these defeats : the Prussians who saw the French already on the banks of the Ems ; and the Spanish, who feared soon to see them on the banks of the Ebro. And Prussia was at the moment deeply engaged in the final division of Poland which gave her Warsaw (October 24) ; Spain was in such a state of timidity that the sound of arms terrified her. Both powers asked for peace (Treaty of Basle, April 5 and July 28) : Prussia ceded the provinces on the left bank of the Rhine, Spain the Spanish possessions in St. Domingo. This peace was the recognition of the republic by two of the great powers of Europe. The Grand Duke of Tuscany had entered into a treaty in the month of February.

England, Austria, Sardinia, and the empire held together. England, in order to relieve the royalist forces in the western provinces of France and weaken the rivalry of Charette and Stofflet, disembarked two divisions of emigrants on the peninsula of Quiberon in Brittany. Hoche, who to appease the Vendeans had been recalled to the army of the Rhine, destroyed them (July 21, 1795).

Reverses at Sea: The "Vengeur."—The Revolution had improvised both generals and armies. But if the genius of land fighting may be drawn from inspiration, sea-warfare demands science and the preparation of years. The brilliant naval staff-officers who had defeated England in the American War had emigrated ; from the year 1790 a third of the officers had left France, with the result that the fine fleet built during the last twenty-five years of the monarchy was without commanders. That was the reason of the inferiority of France in the battles of squadrons. On June 1, 1794, Admiral Villaret-Joyeuse, till lately a simple captain, attacked with twenty-five vessels manned by peasants an English fleet of thirty-eight ships. The French fleet was escorting a large convoy of wheat. The wheat was landed in

safety and some of the French departments thereby saved from famine, but the fleet was beaten and six ships lost. One of them, the *Vengeur*, rather than lower its flag sank to the singing of the *Marseillaise* by its crew. Martinique, Guadeloupe, even Corsica, were taken by the English. But France was avenged by her *corsairs*. By the end of 1793 they had taken 410 ships from the English and her own mercantile marine had lost only 316.

Constitution of the Year III.[1] **(1795).** — The constitution, emerging victorious from the tumults that followed the 8th Thermidor, abolished the democratic constitution of 1793, which had not yet been put into practice, and gave legislative power to two councils, that of the *Five Hundred* and that of the *Ancients*, who examined and accepted the decrees of the inferior court. The executive power was given to a directory of five members, renewed every year by a fifth named by the legislative power. The convention had striven for union—now all was to be divided. The legislative power was to have two heads, the executive power five. It was hoped in this way to escape a dictatorship and arrive at a moderate republic : the constitution of the year III. was nothing but a feeble and anarchical republic.

The 3rd Vendémiaire (October 5, 1795).—Since the 9th Thermidor the Revolution had so quickly risen from the depths to which it had fallen that the royalists hoped for a speedy restoration. They had many partisans in sections of the National Guard in Paris and they were to gain Pichegru by the promise of a million down and a yearly payment of 200,000 livres. They expected the next elections to give them a majority and that they would then be able legally to introduce a counter-revolution. But the convention decided that two-thirds of the new legislative body was to be taken from the conventionals so that the royalists could only form a powerless minority. They therefore raised sections of the National Guard to the number of 40,000 men and marched on the Tuileries where the convention was sitting. Barras, charged with its defence, took for his lieutenant a young general whose services at Toulon had brought him to the front, but who had since been dismissed since the 9th Thermidor: Napoleon Bonaparte. He had only six to seven thousand soldiers. In a few hours he had transformed the Tuileries into an entrenched camp ; the insurgents, received by heavy fire on the *Pont Royal* and in the *Rue St. Honoré* before the church of St. Roch, were at once disorganised, but in their

[1] The convention had substituted for the Gregorian Calendar a Republican Calendar. See end of this chapter.

flight they left 500 of their men on the pavement: the rest were disarmed on the following days. On the 4th Brumaire (October 26, 1795) the convention declared its mission at an end.

Summary of the Principal Acts of the Convention.—The imperious necessities of war had not allowed the assemblies of France to realise all their proposed reforms. They had at least prepared an immense mass of material which the next generation utilised. But in the midst of trials and victories, the convention, in order to fortify the unity of France, had decreed a system of national education; it had created normal schools, central (*Lycées*) and primary schools, schools of medicine, schools of arts and crafts, a chair of modern languages, a bureau of longitude, a conservatoire of music, a natural history museum, and had finally established a uniform system of weights and measures (metric system). The convention had replaced the Gregorian Calendar by a Republican Calendar. The new era commenced on September 22, 1792, it ceased on September 9, 1805. The twelve months were Vendémiaire, Brumaire, Frimaire, for the autumn; Nivôse, Pluviôse, Ventôse, for the winter; Germinal, Floréal, Prairial, for the spring; Messidor, Thermidor, Fructidor, for the summer. Thus one said the 14th Thermidor, year X., instead of the 2nd August, 1802.

By the immoderate issue of *assignats*, of which 44 milliards had been put in circulation, finance was turned upside down: commerce had been ruined by the law of the *maximum*. But by the sale of national property immense domains which had up till then been unproductive were given over to the cultivation of new proprietors. A statement of the national debt had prepared for happier days confidence in the credit of the state. The invention of the aerial telegraph facilitated the rapid transmission of orders from the central government to the frontiers. The founding of museums fostered the taste for art. The convention desired also that the aged and the destitute children should be gathered together and cared for by the state. And the last decree of these formerly terrible legislators was that, after the general restoration of peace, capital punishment should be abolished.

CHAPTER LXII

THE DIRECTORY (OCTOBER 27, 1795, TO NOVEMBER 9, 1799)

Position of the Republic at the End of 1795.—The Council of the Ancients and that of the Five Hundred were constituted on the 27th of October; they were composed two-thirds of conventionals, the other third of newly elected deputies. Some days later five regicides were elected to the directory, La Réveillère-Lépeaux, Rewbel, Letourneur, Carnot, and Barras. The first three, though honest and hard-working, were quite unequal to their task; the fourth, Carnot, was an exceptionally fine man. The new government established itself in the Luxemburg Palace (which was built by Marie de Medicis, 1615–1620; during the Revolution it had been used as a prison). It was a difficult situation: the elective councils which were to administer the departments, the cantons, and the communes, either did nothing or did wrong, and by thus paralysing authority, all the interests of the country suffered. The treasury was empty, the *assignats* fell into complete discredit; commerce and industry had ceased to exist; the armies had neither provisions nor clothes, not even munitions. But three years of such a war had made soldiers and generals: Moreau commanded the army of the Rhine; Jourdan that of the Sambre-and-Meuse; Hoche watched the sea-coast to defend it against the English and to pacify Brittany and Vendée. And he who was to eclipse them all, Bonaparte, then twenty-seven years of age, was given command of the army of the interior, which he soon exchanged for that of the army of Italy.

Napoleon Bonaparte.—Napoleon Bonaparte was born at Ajaccio on August 15th, 1769. His father was Charles Bonaparte, a Corsican nobleman, whose family hailed originally from Italy; his mother was Letizia Ramolino. His father, a judge of Ajaccio and deputy of the Corsican nobility in 1779, died in 1785; his mother died in Rome in 1839. They had eight children [1]; Napoleon was the second son. Admitted to the *École Militaire* of Brienne in 1779, he passed five years later to the *École Militaire* at Paris on the recommendation of his professors, one of whom, his professor of history, gave him this note, "He will go

[1] Five sons, Joseph, Napoleon, Lucien, Louis, Jérome; and three daughters, Elisa, Pauline, Caroline.

far, if circumstances are favourable." The following year he obtained the rank of lieutenant in an artillery regiment of La Fère. His first garrison was Grenoble, his second at Valence. He showed himself favourable to the Revolution, and when Paoli wished to give Corsica to the English in 1793, young Bonaparte was one of an expedition sent against this old family friend. The expedition did not succeed: obliged to fly with all his belongings Bonaparte took refuge at Marseilles where his mother and his sisters lived in narrow circumstances. At the time of the federalist movement at Marseilles, a movement which he opposed, he was made a captain. When the conventional army attacked Toulon, then in the hands of the Anglo-Spanish fleet, the representatives of the people made him commander of a battalion and gave him charge of the artillery during the siege. His general, Cartaux, a brave but incapable man, asked him only to make a breach through which he could pass with his men. Bonaparte insisted that they should think not of the town but of the ships: if their retreat was threatened they would be obliged to fly. He showed the general and the representatives a point at the southern extremity of the sea-passage from which the fleet could be destroyed. "It is there that we can save Toulon," he said. Dugommier had replaced Cartaux. He understood Bonaparte's plan and approved of it. The fort of l'Eguillette was carried and the English hastened to abandon Toulon, which, as they could no longer hold, they set on fire. Bonaparte, as a reward, was made general of a brigade, and went to command the artillery of the Italian army. On the 9th Thermidor his good fortune ceased. His services were no longer required. The 11th Vendémiaire saw him emerge triumphantly from his temporary obscurity. Carnot gave him command of the army of the Alps, with which Scherer, or rather Masséna, had gained the glorious but sterile victory of Loano (November 23 and 24, 1795). And Bonaparte was only twenty-seven years old.

Campaign of Bonaparte in Italy (1796-1797).—Carnot's plan for the campaign of 1796 was both bold and wise. Two generals, already well-known, Jourdan and Moreau, having each seventy to eighty thousand men, were to penetrate into Germany, the first by the valley of the Main, the second by that of the Neckar, in order to reach the basin of the Danube. Thence they were to descend on the hereditary states, which Bonaparte's 38,000 men would threaten from the Italian side. And so, Moreau in the centre, Jourdan and Bonaparte on the two wings, they set forth to carry out this movement, having to support the French

armies on enemy soil and to converge if possible on the road to Vienna. But the three armies were separated : Bonaparte from Moreau by the mass of the Italian Alps ; Moreau from Jourdan by the Franconian Alps. The plan, so happy in success, might have disastrous consequences in misfortune.

When Bonaparte arrived at the army of the Alps, the generals, Masséna, Augereau, Serrurier, Laharpe, Berthier, already celebrated for important services, received the newcomer without enthusiasm to say the least of it. He gathered them together to explain his plans. On leaving this council of war, Masséna said to Augereau, " We have found our master." To the soldiers Bonaparte issued one of those stirring proclamations which electrify the spirit : " Soldiers ! " he said, " you are badly fed and almost naked ; the government owes you much, but can do nothing for you ; your patience, your courage do you honour, but cannot gain for you either glory or profit. I am going to lead you to the most fertile plains in the world ; you will find large towns, wealthy provinces ; you will find honour, glory, and riches. Soldiers of Italy, is courage lacking ? "

The army was encamped on the southern slopes of the Alps and Apennines, where it had existed miserably for four years, skirmishing against Sardinian and Austrian troops. The Sardinians were at Céva ; the Austrians were for the most part cavalry stationed on the Apennines further east in the valley of the Bormida and the river of Genoa, towards Voltri. Beaulieu was in command and wanted to act quickly. He did not wish, he told the King of Sardinia, to take off his boots till he arrived at Lyons. Bonaparte had 38,000 men against 60,000. He resolved at once to take the offensive, and he did so with extraordinary boldness. Instead of using his forces in the midst of these barren rocks, where he could strike no hard blows, he repeated on a larger scale the manœuvre which had caused the fall of the camp at Saorigio in 1794, and which, followed by Masséna in 1795, had secured Scherer the victory of Loano. He turned to cross the Alps at the lowest part of the chain, towards the sources of the Bormida at the Col di Montenotte, whilst Beaulieu waited for him beside the sea near Voltri. Bonaparte placed himself by this clever strategy opposite the weakest point of the Austro-Piedmontese forces. He broke through their centre at Montenotte (April 11 and 12), established himself between them, and in order the better to separate them, fought them one after the other : the Piedmontese in the gorge of the Millesimo (April 13 and 14), the Austrians at Dego (April 14 and

15). He was then master of the route to Turin on which the Piedmontese retreated and of the route to Milan by which the Austrians retreated. But he did not halt; he pursued the Sardinian army closely and defeated them utterly at Mondovi (April 22); by the armistice of Cherasco he obliged them to lay down their arms. This armistice, which he signed two leagues from Turin, was changed on June 3 to a treaty of peace, thereby securing for France Savoy and the counties of Nice and Tenda; it also opened to Bonaparte the three strongholds Coni, Tortona, and Allessandria, which he used as bases for the offensive advance he meditated.

Delivered from one enemy, he turned to the other. Beaulieu, frightened by these rapid blows, fell back in great haste; Bonaparte followed him. The Austrians stopped for a short time to recover their breath at the junction of the Tessin and the Po, where they covered their positions by entrenchments. Bonaparte crossed the Po behind them and at Piacenza (May 9) he defeated one of the divisions, and following the Adda to Lodi he found the Austrians taking refuge on the left bank of that river in a formidable position. Thirty cannon covered the bridge of Lodi, a hundred fathoms long: 12,000 men guarded the defile. Bonaparte formed—under the protection of the houses of the town—a body of 6000 grenadiers and hurled them at the bridge, led by Masséna. They rushed across it at full speed, killed the gunners at their posts, and overwhelmed the infantry who came running to defend the guns (May 11). The Oglio was crossed without opposition. But Beaulieu, resting his right flank on Peschiera, his left on Mantua, still tried to guard the line of the Mincio. Bonaparte deceived him as to the real point of attack, forced his way through at Borghetto (May 30), and threw back into the Tyrol that army which had not long since threatened the frontiers of France.

And while he fought he negotiated. He gave an armistice to the Duke of Parma for a consideration of 20 millions, some munitions, and 20 pictures. He dealt with the Duke of Modena on the same terms. The pope promised 21 millions, 100 pictures, 500 manuscripts. In Lombardy he made a war levy of 20 millions, sending 10 to the directory, who had only been able to give him 2000 louis at the beginning of his campaign and one million to Moreau to help him with his preparations on the Rhine. Bonaparte supplied his army, his government, his colleagues.

He had reached the Adige, where he occupied the Venetian town of Verona to punish Venice for having violated her

neutrality in allowing the Austrians to enter Peschiera. He waited behind this excellent line of defence, which, running from the mountains to the sea, covered Lombardy: he besieged Mantua, one of the strongest places of Europe (June 3).

But Wurmser, one of Austria's best generals, had succeeded Beaulieu, and a second army, more numerous and more warlike, succeeded the first. Wurmser had 60,000 men against Bonapart's 30,000, but he divided his forces. Quasdanovich descended by the Trentino to the right of the Lake of Garda and Wurmser arrived at the other side by the two banks of the Adige. Bonaparte foresaw that he could defeat these two armies—imprudently divided—one after the other. He raised the siege of Mantua in order to have all his forces united and concentrated behind the Mincio. In carrying all his forces, first from his right to his left and then from his left to his right, he stopped Quasdanovich at Salo: he overwhelmed him at Lonato (August 3) and Wurmser at Castiglione (August 5). The aged marshal, threatened with being cut off from the Tyrol, had only time to escape. But he received reinforcements which gave him an army of 50,000 men and he commenced a second campaign. While he descended the valley of the Brenta, Bonaparte, who wished to forestall him, having reascended the valley of the Adige, overwhelmed the Austrians at Roveredo, where they had been left to guard the Tyrol (September 6). Arrived at Trent, Bonaparte began an offensive march against Wurmser. Instead of going back to wait for his arrival behind the line of the Adige, he turned to the right and threw his forces into the valley of the Brenta, following Wurmser, whom he overtook and fought at Bassano (September 8). Wurmser was caught between Bonaparte's army and the river; Bonaparte would have taken him prisoner had not a bridge which he had overlooked provided the veteran commander with means of evading the shame of surrender. He was enabled to make his way to Mantua. The Battle of St. George hemmed him in (September 15).

Three armies had already disappeared, a fourth arrived. Austria, which had become alarmed by a defeat at the hands of Jourdan and by the presence of Moreau on the Danube, sent large forces into Italy: Alvinzi collected 60,000 men. The Austrian force already in Italy seemed to be lost, all the peninsula behind it was in a state of tumult: this time the enemy advanced with prudence. Forty thousand men occupied the strong position of Caldiero, confronting Verona; twenty thousand more with Davidovich came down by Rivoli to join

their compatriots before Verona. Bonaparte made a desperate effort before Caldiero: he was repulsed. He re-entered Verona and set off along the road to Milan, which is also the way to France, the way of retreat. The inhabitants and the soldiers congratulated themselves, "Bonaparte is abandoning this venture." But all at once he turned to the left along the Adige, descended its banks as far as Ronco, crossed the river, and established his forces in the midst of a marsh intersected by the great high roads. The soldiers clapped their hands; they understood the plan of their general. He had turned to the left of the position of Caldiero which he had vainly approached from the front: he had rendered useless the formidable defences of the enemy and had found a battlefield where superiority of numbers counted for nothing. For three days the battle raged along these high roads (November 15-17). Augereau and Masséna headed their columns: Bonaparte was himself in the forefront, a flag in his hand, on the bridge of Arcola, which his grenadiers hesitated to cross under a heavy fire of grape-shot. He was driven back on to the marsh; he was all but taken when his men rushed forward in time to save him. While guarding the ground taken each day he sent the bulk of his forces back behind the Adige every night, to be ready to turn against Davidovich should he emerge from the mountains. On the third day, Bonaparte engaged him at the foot of the mountains, Alvinzi took to flight, leaving behind him 10,000 dead and 6,000 prisoners. The French army re-entered Verona by way of Vicenza, the opposite direction to that from which it had emerged (November 15, 16, 17).

Six weeks later (January, 1797) Alvinzi, reinforced, appeared again with 60,000 men. This time the principal Austrian attack was delivered in the mountains of the upper Adige, the secondary attack by the river side. Bonaparte discovered the only place where the different forces of the army, moving slowly and with difficulty in a mountainous country, could unite; and that was the plateau of Rivoli. A long column of infantry without horses or guns was to travel by footpaths; the cavalry, artillery, and baggage were to approach by the high road. Bonaparte determined at any price to prevent the junction of these two forces, in themselves incomplete but together composing a formidable army. He had only 16,000 men against 40,000; he established his army at the point where the Austrian forces were to meet. He prevented them from acting together; the moment they appeared he threw Joubert on them, then Masséna. The two

columns, taken by surprise, were thrown into a panic and retired in unutterable confusion. Bonaparte followed them and defeated them. At that moment he heard that Provera with 20,000 men had crossed the Adige and proceeded to the relief of Wurmser. He left Joubert to force back into the Tyrol the half-ruined army of Alvinzi; he himself rushed with Masséna's division to deal with Provera. This division had fought on the 13th before Verona, had marched all the next night to the help of Joubert, had fought all the 14th at Rivoli, and was now to march for a day and a night to fight on the 16th before Mantua. Never had even the most vaunted troops accomplished anything to compare with this.

Provera surrendered; defeated at St. George (January 15) and at La Favorite (January 16) he was compelled to lay down arms. Wurmser, reduced to the last extremities, his garrison having eaten his last horse, gave up Mantua (February 2). "And so in ten months the army of Piedmont, three other formidable armies, with three bodies of reinforcements, were destroyed by an army which, though it numbered 35,000 men at the beginning of the campaign, received only 20,000 to make good its losses. Thus 55,000 French soldiers defeated more than 200,000 Austrians, took more than 80,000 prisoners, killed or wounded more than 20,000; fought twelve pitched battles, more than sixty other actions, crossed many rivers, braving the floods and the fire of the enemy." War, waged in such a way and for a noble cause, becomes a magnificent spectacle.

During the struggle against Wurmser the regency of Modena showed its sympathy with the Austrians; at the approach of Alvinzi the pontifical troops went into action. Bonaparte, even before Arcola, pronounced the disinheritance of the duke; his estates were formed into the Cispadane republic. After Rivoli Bonaparte marched on Rome. Pius VI., in fear and trembling, signed the Peace of Tolentino; it cost him 30 millions, the Romagna (Ravenna, Rimini, etc.), which was united with the legations of Ferrara and Bologna to the Cispadane republic, and Ancona, occupied till the declaration of peace by a French garrison (February 10, 1797). In October of the previous year an expedition sent by Bonaparte from Leghorn had driven the English out of Corsica.

Retreat of Moreau (October, 1796).—The armies in Germany had neither such favourable conditions nor such successful issues. At first Jourdan and Moreau drove the Austrians before them; Moreau defeated them at Rastadt (July 5) and at Ett-

lingen (July 9), which gave him access to the mountain passes; but Carnot, instead of advising the two generals to unite their 120,000 men in the valley of the Danube, ordered them to act independently and separated them from each other in commanding them to outflank the wings of the enemy forces. The Archduke Charles on the contrary concentrated his forces between Ulm and Ratisbon and then tried to force Moreau to retreat in attacking him at Neresheim (August 10). The archduke was repulsed and conceived the bold plan of stealing away from Moreau with part of his forces, hurrying them from the valley of the Danube into that of the Main, uniting with Wartensleben, who was retreating before Jourdan, and, after overwhelming the latter (who was in fact held up at Neumark and Amberg and had been defeated at Würzburg on September 3), throwing him back behind the Lahn (September 10). It was the same manœuvre which had been so successful with Bonaparte at the outset of his Italian campaign. It had the same success, but not the same consequences, for Moreau was not Beaulieu; the archduke was not Bonaparte. He lost precious time instead of attacking the second French army which was already in the interior of Bavaria; Moreau retreated slowly, stopping whenever he was closely pressed to inflict severe punishment on the Austrians who followed him (victory of Biberach, October 2). He crossed the Black Forest by the Hôllenthal without having left behind him a single ammunition waggon or a single soldier in this magnificent retreat of twenty-six days. He re-entered Alsace when and how he would, by Brisach and Huningen (October 18).

Last Victories of Bonaparte in Italy: Preliminaries of Leoben (1797).—The marvellous victories of the army in Italy happily compensated for this reverse. The Italian army had not yet quite finished its task; the Archduke Charles, the victor of Jourdan, arrived in his turn with a fourth army, which took its stand on the borders of the Carnic and Julian Alps, from the source of the Adige to the mouth of the Tagliamento. Bonaparte frustrated his designs. He proposed to cut this semicircle at three points. On the left he sent Joubert by the Tyrol to the Brenner Pass; in the centre he sent Masséna by the Col di Tarvis which carries the main road from Verona to Vienna; while he himself marched against the archduke, who guarded behind the Tagliamento the approaches to Trieste. The river was forced on March 16; on the 19th a furious battle secured Masséna the Col di Tarvis; Joubert after many vigorous blows

on the upper Adige arrived at the Brenner. The chain of the Alps was conquered. The French had now only to descend their northern slopes. Whilst Joubert proceeded down the Putersthal to join Masséna, Bonaparte arrived on March 31 at Klagenfurt on the Drave. The archduke wished to prevent him from penetrating to the basin of the Mühr; but Bonaparte forced the gorge at Newmark (April 1); he entered Loeben on the 7th and pushed his advance-guard to the summit of the Soemmering, whence the hills of Vienna, twenty-five leagues to the north, were clearly visible.

At this juncture Hoche and Moreau began operations. The first, at the head of the army of the Sambre-and-Meuse, crossed the Rhine in the face of the enemy: in four days he had marched thirty-five leagues, gained three battles (Neuwied, April 17, Ukerath, and Altenkirchen), and fought five other actions. He was about to surround the Austrian army of Kray when news of the armistice imposed by Bonaparte on the Archduke Charles arrested his triumphal progress. Desaix, Moreau's lieutenant, also crossed the river and drove the enemy into the Black Mountains. Had Bonaparte known of these successes he would have refused to negotiate: but the court of Vienna, in alarm, hastened to sign the preliminaries of Leoben (April 18) on the basis that France should have Belgium and that Austria should received as an indemnity the provinces of Venice in compensation for the loss of the provinces of Milan.

Venice had taken advantage of Bonaparte's absence to massacre the sick and wounded French soldiers; it tried also to carry out on the rear of the French armies an Italian Vendée; but it expiated the cowardice of its senate. Forty thousand men penetrated into Venice, where they established a provisory republic. The senate of Genoa was defeated like that of Venice for outrages against France, but the Ligurian republic kept her liberty together with her French alliance. England, dismayed by the numerous reverses of her ally, offered to negotiate, and a peace conference met at Lille.

Internal Anarchy.—While the republic was victorious abroad, at home the situation grew worse under a divided government which was consequently neither respected nor obeyed and which was incapable of subduing contrary elements. At the beginning, however, it was strong enough to frustrate the plans of two extreme parties. The first, prepared in the Vendée by Charette with the connivance of England, was stifled with the help of General Hoche. Charette and Stofflet were delivered over to the

republicans and shot (February and March, 1796). The second, that of Babœuf, who proposed the equal division of the country and its wealth among all the citizens, had hardly been mooted (May, 1796) when it was stopped by the execution of its two principal leaders, but it left as a legacy the bloodthirsty outrages of disappointed communists. A Jacobin conspiracy to seize the camp of Grenelle during the night was as unfruitful (September 9, 1796).

There was therefore excuse for violent factions in the directory; it sank under its own weight and disorder reigned supreme. The *mandats territoriaux* (territorial money orders) which had replaced the *assignats* (March, 1796) had fallen into the same discredit. The financial crisis, which had become acute, led the government to the practice of fatal expedients; the whole directory was accused of embezzlement, though Barras alone was guilty. The country, like its government, went blindly on at random. The need of relaxation took possession of a society so lately escaped from the terror. The people threw themselves headlong into all forms of pleasure-seeking; every path led to money-making; the dissolution of morals was unbridled, gambling was carried likewise to unheard-of excesses; the police did nothing, bands of brigands multiplied. The south was laid waste by the *compagnons de Jéhu* and the *enfants du Soleil;* the *chauffeurs* terrified the west. It seemed as if the whole state was on the verge of dissolution.

Progress of the Royalists.—The royalists thought it would be easy to destroy this tottering government. The emigrants returned in crowds. They caused anxiety to those who had recently bought up national land and in the *Société de Clichy* they openly urged a counter-revolution. Emboldened by their successes in the elections of the year V. for the reconstruction of the councils, they succeeded in making Pichegru president of the Five Hundred, Barbé-Marbois of the Ancients, and replaced Letourneur, the retiring member of the directory, by Barthélemy, one of their own party. A restoration of the monarchy in favour of the Bourbons seemed imminent. The Pretender, Louis XVIII., brother of Louis XVI.,[1] thought himself on the point of being recalled and was busy making his conditions. But it would have required greater misfortunes to decide the country so soon to restore what it had but lately dispensed with. The armies were thoroughly republican, and

[1] The son of Louis XVI., whom the emigrants had called Louis XVII., had died at the Temple in 1795 of misery and ill-treatment.

from the banks of the Adige Bonaparte promised his co-operation against the royalists.

The idea of respect for the law and peaceful reforms was so completely lost that there was everywhere the desire to return to force. The members of the majority in the two councils conspired for the overthrow of the constitution—in virtue of which it existed—the directory defended it while violating it. To the strategy of the parliamentary state it replied by a stroke of the government and the army.

The 18th Fructidor, Year V. (September 4, 1797).—During the night of the 18th Fructidor, Augereau brought 12,000 men into Paris, who surrounded the building in which the meetings of the council were held. The two minorities, on the invitation of the directory, declared themselves permanently elected and annulled the mandates of their colleagues, whose chairs remained vacant. They re-established all the revolutionary laws so lately abolished, and condemned fifty-three deputies to deportation: Pichegru, Barbé-Marbois, Boissy d'Anglas, Portalis, and Camille Jordan; besides two members of the directory—Carnot, who did not wish to resort to violence against the royalists, and Barthélemy, who favoured that cause. These directors were replaced by Merlin de Douai and François de Neufchâteau. Many royalists were added to the list of deportations, and taken, some to Cayenne, others to Oléron.

Death of Hoche (1797).—For several months Moreau had held proofs of the treachery of Pichegru; he produced them at this point, but his delay in making these revelations caused him also to be suspected and he was dismissed. The two armies of the Rhine were entrusted to Hoche, who was regarded as a second Bonaparte and in whom the republicans had great hopes. A few days after taking over this great command, he died at the age of twenty-nine, leaving behind him one of the greatest and fairest names of the Revolution.

Treaty of Campo-Formio (1797).—The directory, fortified by its new members, proposed to continue the war and broke off the negotiations entered upon with England. But Bonaparte wished peace in order that his dazzling glory as general should be enhanced by his new rôle of Peacemaker. In spite of the government, who rightly refused to deliver the Venetians over to Austria, he signed the Treaty of Campo-Formio, the most glorious peace France ever concluded (October 17, 1797). The emperor ceded Belgium, recognised the possession by France of the left bank of the Rhine and the Ionian Islands: he accepted

the establishment of the Cisalpine republic (Milan, Modena, Bologna), and as an indemnity he was to receive, instead of Venice, which Austria had now lost, Istria, the Friuli, and Dalmatia—lands which Austria still holds, whilst nothing now remains to France of what she gained at that time.

Bonaparte had calculated well: his fame increased by this peace for which he had made no new victories. He was made general of the army of England (*i.e.* to operate against England) and plenipotentiary of the Congress of Rastadt. Having settled the affairs of Italy, he went to Rastadt, but impatient of the delays of German diplomacy, he soon proceeded to Paris, where the government and the people gave him a triumphal reception. The army of Italy was associated with the honours awarded to its general. The directory gave it a flag on which these words were inscribed: "This army has made 150,000 prisoners, taken 170 flags, 540 artillery and siege guns, 5 bridges, 9 ships, 12 frigates, 12 corvettes, 18 galleys, given liberty to the people of the north of Italy, of Corcyre, of the Ægean Sea, of Ithaca; sent to Paris the masterpieces of Michael Angelo, Guercino, Titian, Paolo Veronese, Correggio Albano, the Carraci, Raphael, etc.; triumphed in 18 pitched battles and fought 67 actions."

Egyptian Expedition (May, 1798, to August, 1799).—Austria had laid down her arms, but the English, unassailable in their island, could not consent to leave France so many conquests. War continued between them. Hoche and Truguet had wished to fight England hand to hand; that was the right policy. An army was prepared, Bonaparte was in command and visited the ports where the preparations were going forward; but he found the means so inadequate to the end that he renounced the enterprise to the directory. He resolved at any price to keep himself well to the fore in public opinion, and not allow himself to be forgotten. He proposed an expedition of which he had often dreamt in Italy, the conquest of Egypt. "Nothing great can be done," he said, "except in the East." From the banks of the Nile he hoped to strike at England through India, to give her a vital blow in destroying her commerce and her empire. The great Leibnitz had proposed the same plan to Louis XIV. in 1672. Now it was possible; in 1798 it meant nothing but one enemy more for France, Turkey, her former ally. To risk 40,000 of her best soldiers on such a distant expedition, it would have seemed necessary for France to have command of the sea. But England covered it with her fleets. It was to play a great game, but that was the way to fascinate and command public

interest and sympathy. The expedition was prepared in secret, concealed under the name of the left wing of the army of England. The squadron, composed of fourteen ships of the line and a great number of transports, left Toulon on May 10th: Brueys was in command. The expedition consisted of 36,000 men, nearly all veterans of Arcola and Rivoli. Scholars, artists, engineers, and labourers were attached to the army. According to Bonaparte's plan, colonisation was to follow conquest.

Everything went well at first; Malta was taken in passing: the chevaliers did not even defend it. Nelson, the English admiral, who sailed from one side of the Mediterranean to the other looking for the fleet to fight it, missed it by several days. The disembarkation was carried out on July 1 at four places near Alexandria, which was carried by assault some hours later.

Bonaparte marched at once on Cairo where the redoubtable militia of the mamelukes, the real masters of the country rather than the Porte, had concentrated their principal forces under Mourad-Bey. The journey was long and painful, especially the crossing of the great desert of Damanhour. There were privations of every kind. The soldiers contented themselves with pitying their general, who allowed himself to be carried "like a good child," or else they amused themselves with pleasantries: "He laughs at all this," they said speaking of Caffarelli, who had lost a leg on the Rhine, "he has always one foot in France." The army arrived at Chebreiss: the mamelukes, repulsed in a first engagement, fell back on Cairo and prepared for a pitched battle. The French army followed them, and on July 21 stopped, struck dumb with admiration before the Pyramids which stand near that town. "Soldiers," cried Bonaparte, "from the heights of these Pyramids forty centuries look down on you!" A new system of warfare was necessary against the innumerable and valiant cavalry of the mamelukes, operating in the midst of the desert. Bonaparte discovered it. He formed his divisions into squares and disposed them in such a way that they protected each other mutually by their fire, like so many living citadels. It was in vain that the mamelukes rushed forward with the most brilliant courage, they could not break those lines of fire and iron. Many hurled themselves on the points of the French bayonets and were killed. Mourad-Bey retired wounded to Upper Egypt: the other Bey, Ibrahim, fled towards Syria. The occupation of Cairo and the submission of Lower Egypt were the price of this victory (Battle of the Pyramids, July 21).

Bonaparte hastened to organise the country: he respected the

beliefs and customs of the people who called him the "favourite of the great Allah"; he took part in the festival of the Nile (August 18) and in that of the prophet; but he also looked after the wellbeing of his soldiers, and he established in one of the largest palaces of Cairo the *Institute of Egypt*, the members of which — Monge, Berthollet, Fourier, Dolomieu, Larrey, Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, etc.—commenced the scientific conquest of that mysterious country which did not begin to reveal its secrets till the genius of France had touched it.

The news of the disaster to the fleet surprised Bonaparte in the midst of his labours. He had recommended Brueys to leave the harbour of Aboukir. An unfortunate delay gave the English time to arrive. The line whence the French ships delivered their broadsides had not been formed near enough the bank; part of the English fleet was able to pass between it and the shore, while the other half sailed on the other side, between the French fleet and the open sea. It was a bold manœuvre which Nelson attempted. But it succeeded. Every ship of the left wing of the French fleet, lying motionless at anchor, received on two sides the concentrated fire of the whole enemy fleet, which advanced slowly, destroying one by one the French ships. The commander of the right wing, Villeneuve, should have copied this movement and manœuvred his squadron to the left wing of Nelson's fleet, so that it also would have been between two fires, like the head of the French line. The signal was given him, but smoke prevented him from seeing how to carry out the manœuvre, and when he saw the *Orient* of 120 guns take fire and sink, and two other French ships heel over and go down, he sailed away with two ships and two frigates to take refuge at Malta. Admiral Brueys, gravely wounded, refused to descend between decks, saying that an admiral must die on the bridge. He was killed by a bullet. The French fleet, with the exception of Villeneuve's ships, was annihilated (August 1). The Egyptian expedition, which was to have given France the empire of the Mediterranean where she had already four of the most important positions, Toulon, Malta, Corfu, and Alexandria, was only an adventure, instead of being the beginning of a great enterprise.

France was imprisoned in her conquest and the Porte declared against her. Bonaparte said to his soldiers, "Well! we must die here, where we can at least quit the world nobly like the ancients," and he wrote to Kleber, whom he had left at Alexandria: "This obliges us to do even greater things than we had intended. We must hold ourselves ready." Kleber replied: "Yes, we

must do great things: I am preparing myself." Bonaparte commenced by achieving the conquest of the whole country. A revolt had broken out at Cairo (October); he repressed it with severity. Desaix, "the real Sultan," as he was called by the Arabs, went off in pursuit of Mourad-Bey, who had already taken possession of the Thebaïd, and the French regiments encamped near the cataracts of Syene, the boundary of the ancient Roman world.

Assured of conquest, Bonaparte advanced towards Syria whence he could command Egypt and menace at his will either Constantinople or India (February, 1799). He was successful at first; he took possession of Gaza and Jaffa (where the French soldiers were infected by the plague), and dispersed a large Turkish army at the Battle of Tabor (April 16). But at the siege of St. John d'Acre all his genius failed him, for want of the necessary means, against the courage of the Turks and the tenacity of the English admiral, Sidney Smith, of whom he often said in after years, "That man has cost me my fortune." Having neither munitions nor big guns, he could not open practicable breaches: after sixty days of trench warfare and eight of murderous assaults he led his army, worn out by fatigue and exhausted by disease, into Egypt (May 20). An English fleet had disembarked 18,000 janizaries at Aboukir; Napoleon with his native forces drove them back into the sea (July 24). It was after this brilliant action that Kleber cried in an outburst of enthusiasm: "General, you are as great as the world!" The army of Egypt had nothing more to fear, but it had also nothing more to do, and this inaction was insufferable to Bonaparte. When he learned that a second coalition had been formed, that Italy was lost, that France was about to be invaded, he gave over the command to Kleber and boarding a frigate boldly crossed the Mediterranean, in spite of the English cruisers in these waters. On the 8th of October he disembarked at Frejus.

Bad Administration of the Directory: The 22nd Floréal (May 11, 1798).—The directory, now feeble, now violent at home, had lost abroad the magnificent position to which France had attained through the Treaty of Campo-Formio. On the 18th Fructidor it had struck a blow at the royalists; on the 22nd Floréal (May 11, 1798) it attacked the deputies known as *patriots*, by cancelling their election. The directory wished to govern apparently only by sudden and autocratic measures; it thereby showed its weakness, a strong government would not have required to resort to such means. Some months previously it had caused a veritable

bankruptcy. The interest of the debt amounted to 258 millions; the directory met two-thirds of this by bonds on national property, which lost five-sixths of their nominal value; the other third was *consolidated* and inscribed in the national debt. The directory also carried public irritation to a height by two tyrannical measures: a forced and progressive loan of 100 millions and a law of hostages against the relatives of emigrants and the ex-nobility: this measure destroyed the security of 150,000 families. Abroad, the directory provoked Europe by its imprudent actions. It overthrew the temporal power of the pope and discontented the Batavian, Cisalpine, and Ligurian republics—created by that of France—allowing them to be robbed by unscrupulous factors. And finally it was not able to exact obedience from its generals; Championnet at Naples and Brune in Lombardy simply imprisoned the representatives of the directory.

Second Coalition (March, 1799, to March, 1802).—The spectacle of internal disorganisation, the absence of Bonaparte with the most seasoned French army, which seemed lost among the sands of Egypt, decided the continental powers to give ear to Pitt's advice. England, Austria, Russia, a part of Germany, Naples, Piedmont, Turkey, and even the barbarian states united against France. France, without money, without commerce, having lost the new force and life given her by the great republic of '93, and having neither the military enthusiasm nor the strong organisation of Europe, found herself confronted by serious dangers.

The councils, in order to face the attacks of Europe, decreed the law of conscription, which called all citizens of twenty to twenty-five years to military service and it ordered a levy of 200,000 men. The King of Naples by an imprudent attack gave France an unexpected triumph. He thought single-handed to deliver Italy and invade the territory of the Roman republic. Championnet commanded 25,000 men; he allowed the Neapolitans to advance as far as Rome, then fell on them with fury, followed them closely to the walls of Naples which the *lazzaroni* defended in three days of street fighting. The Parthenopean republic was soon proclaimed (January, 1799). Joubert had at the same time, and with equal facility, driven the King of Sardinia from Piedmont (December 9, 1798).

Reverses in Italy and Germany: Defeats of Stokach, Magnano, Cassano, La Trebbia (1799).—But the coalition had 360,000 men on a war footing; the directory had only 170,000 divided in five

armies: Macdonald, the successor of Championnet, and Brune were at the two extremities, at Naples and in Holland; Jourdan and Scherer were on the wings, in Germany and Italy; Masséna in the centre, in Switzerland. Since the last war a revolution had taken place in that country. Switzerland had given herself a new constitution founded on a basis of greater equality, and had signed a treaty of alliance with France, permitting France military occupation of Switzerland. It was a considerable advantage, because Switzerland formed a salient which penetrated deeply into France between Italy and Germany, and which was watered by the Rhine. Masséna advanced to this limit, whilst Scherer in Italy approached the Adige, which the Treaty of Campo-Formio had given to Austria, together with Verona and Legnago.

On March 1st Jourdan crossed the Rhine, while the Austrians were still behind the Lech, and advanced between the Danube and the Lake of Constance to be in the same latitude as Masséna; the latter crossed the line of the Rhine and sent his light cavalry to the upper valley of the Inn in order to help Scherer in crossing the Tyrol. But the Archduke Charles stopped Jourdan at Stokach, the junction of routes between Switzerland and Swabia, by superior forces, and obliged him to retreat to the narrow passes of the Black Forest, later even to the Rhine (March 22).

In Italy Scherer found himself on the scene of the great operations of 1796 and 1797; but he did not know how to profit from the lessons Bonaparte had given him; he wanted to force the passage of the Adige first in the mountains and then in the lower reaches of the river. A series of badly calculated movements tired his men and sent them scattered and half-hearted to the Battle of Magnano, near Verona, a battle won by Kray (April 5). Scherer lost his head, and without making any further attempts, he abandoned the lines of the Mincio and the Oglio as if after a disaster, and did not halt till he was safely behind the Adda. Masséna was obliged to follow this retreat; he ceased to hold the line of the Rhine from St. Gotthard to Constance and took up his position behind the line formed by the Linth, the Lake of Zürich, and the Limmat. Having this great lake in front of him and being firmly established in the rear on the mountains of Albis, he commanded the whole of Switzerland and held the armies of Germany and Italy in check.

But the Italians came on. Thirty thousand Russians had rejoined the 60,000 Austrians of Mélas, and Souwaroff, surnamed

the *Invincible*, commanded the combined armies. On April 27 this force crossed the Adda, just when Scherer had given over his command to Moreau, that is to say, the task of rescuing his army from almost inevitable defeat. Moreau had no time to alter the unfortunate dispositions of his predecessor: he was defeated at Cassano (April 28). On the same day the Austrian court soiled its hands by the commission of wilful murder: the French ministers attending a congress at Rastadt, at which the peace of the empire was being discussed, were assassinated by Austrian hussars.

The defeat of Cassano cast no slight on Moreau's reputation, for it could not be imputed to him, and he made a good retreat from the Adda to Turin and thence to Genoa, a retreat which while not so famous as that of 1796 was yet more noteworthy. Macdonald found himself in difficulties in the south of the peninsula. He returned to Naples in great haste, and it was in order to allow him to debouch on the flank of the coalition army that Moreau drew it after him towards Turin. When Macdonald drew near, Moreau hastened his forces into the Apennines in order to be ready to co-operate with him on the plain of Piacenza. But the Neapolitan army lost some days in Tuscany for rest and reorganisation and thus gave Souwaroff time to establish himself on the Trebbia between the two French generals. Macdonald could not break through the enemies' lines in a three days' battle called the Battle of Trebbia (June 17-19). He lost 15,000 men and was forced to follow the precipitous and rocky footpaths of the Apennines in order to return to Genoa and the army of Moreau. Both these generals were dismissed and replaced by Joubert: Moreau consented generously to give him his advice. A new and sanguinary action at Novi, where Joubert was killed, completed the loss of Italy to France (August 15).

Victories of Brune at Bergen (September 19, 1799) and of Masséna at Zürich (September 25 and 26, 1799).—Even the territory of the republic was threatened; two victories, gained at six days' interval, saved the situation. Brune fought an army of 40,000 English and Russian troops disembarked in Holland at Bergen on September 19 and forced them to seek refuge in their ships. Masséna won the immortal victory of Zürich. Souwaroff would have nothing to do with the affairs of Austria in Italy. He had written to the King of Sardinia inviting him to return to his states. But that was not to the mind of the court of Vienna, which found Turin very convenient after Venice and Milan. To put an end to these difficulties the Aulic Council,

which had supreme control of the operations, contrived to send Souwaroff back to Switzerland under the pretext that the climate of that country would suit the Russian soldiers better; they then ordered the archduke to descend on the Rhine. In this way there were no longer any soldiers in Italy save the Austrian army under Mélas, in Germany the Austrians under the archduke; Switzerland had now only Russian troops. If the move was strong politically, it was a military mistake, for it involved a flank march from Turin to Strasburg in face of Masséna and within his reach. He would doubtless find occasion to punish this temerity. As a matter of fact he took the coalition by surprise in the midst of this manœuvre, after the archduke had left Switzerland and before Souwaroff had entered it. Throwing himself at the psychological moment on Zürich, he surrounded it, wiped out a Russian army corps, sent another corps who were guarding the Linth to the right about, and when Souwaroff arrived from the St. Gotthard, after great fatigues and losses, thinking to fall on the right flank of the French army frightened by a sharp frontal attack, he encountered victorious troops who thrust him back on impassable and rocky gorges from which he only emerged with the loss of a great part of his army. The success of all these manœuvres, called the Battle of Zürich (September 25 and 26), cost the coalition 30,000 men and the defection of Russia. For Russia reproached the Austrians with treason, when they had only to reproach her with a bad plan of campaign, and retired from the campaign. Bonaparte himself had no more glorious battle; for those victories which assure the welfare of a country are of more value than those which only add to her power, or to the glory of her leaders.

The 20th Prairial (June 18, 1799).—France was saved; the country no longer accused her government of having exposed it to such great perils. The councils had been able to revenge themselves on the directory for the days of the 18th Fructidor and the 22nd Floréal, by forcing Treilhard, La Réveillère, and Merlin de Douai to give in their resignations (30th Prairial, June 18, 1799). But it helped little to change the men, for the cause of evil lay in the institutions themselves. Anarchy continued. It was no longer the royalists—as on the 18th Fructidor—who tried to profit by it, but the last of the Jacobins. The *Club du Manège*, who counted among its members Jourdan, Augereau, and Bernadotte, then Minister for War, launched forth in violent movements against the directory, just as it had formerly done against the *Société royaliste de Clichy*. The government easily

got the better of this party in reawakening memories of the '93 and in exciting the alarm of the moderate party. Bernadotte was dismissed, the *Club de Manège* was closed, and the government continued to make mistakes (August and September, 1799).

It was at this point that Bonaparte landed at Frejus.

The 18th Brumaire (November 9, 1799).—His return was greeted with transports of joy, which showed him that he was master of the situation. At once the different parties came to him and offered him power. He held himself reserved, impenetrable. He retired to his little house in the *rue de la Victoire* and seemed to live only for his sister, for his wife Josephine Beauharnais, whom he had married after the 11th Vendémiaire, and for his colleagues of the *Institute*, whose uniform he wore when he appeared at any public ceremony. But all the time he was observing and calculating. The country repulsed the royalists because it did not wish to return to the ancient regime; it repulsed the Jacobins because it did not wish to return to '93. It had firmly made up its mind to keep the Revolution. But the Revolution was a dual movement; it was social and political; it had been accomplished to obtain equality and liberty. Anarchy compromised these two benefits: to save the one France postponed the other: she threw herself into the arms of Bonaparte and asked him to guarantee the social conquests of the Revolution in assuring order, the first need of society; liberty would come later. And Bonaparte accepted.

Every one conspired: Siéyès in the directory; Fouché and Talleyrand in the ministry; a hundred others in the councils. "In order to save France," said Siéyès, "we need a head and a sword." He reserved to Bonaparte the rôle of the sword.

On the 18th Brumaire the majority of the Council of Ancients decreed the removal of the two councils to St. Cloud, and entrusted the execution of the decree to Bonaparte, who was given command of all the troops. Three members of the directory, Siéyès, Roger-Ducos, and Barras gave in their resignation; Moulins and Gohier, who refused to resign, were put in custody in the Luxemburg. Paris was full of troops. The next day Bonaparte went to St. Cloud. He went first to the Ancients. "The country," he said, "has no more zealous defender than myself. But its welfare rests on you alone. There is no longer a government; dangers press on every side. Let us avoid the loss of two things for which we have made so many sacrifices, liberty and equality. . . ." "And the Constitution," they cried, "what of it?" "The Constitution!" he replied. "You yourselves

violated it on the 18th Fructidor, the 22nd Floréal, the 30th Prairial. . . . I do not speak in this way in order to gain power for myself. I was offered power on my return to Paris. The different factions came to knock at my door ; I did not listen to them because I do not belong to any party, because I belong only to the great party of the people of France." Furious cries were heard in the Five Hundred. "Down with the dictator! Down with the bayonets!" was heard on every side when Bonaparte entered the hall followed by grenadiers. He was surrounded, crushed, threatened. The grenadiers had to separate some of the groups. The deputies demanded that Bonaparte should be outlawed. His brother Lucien, who presided at the council, tried in vain to justify him. Not being able to make himself heard, he laid down his insignia of office, left the hall, and spoke to the troops : "The majority of the council," he said, "is oppressed by a handful of agitators." In the name of the people he commanded the soldiers to expel these agitators. On the order of Bonaparte General Leclerc entered the assembly ; the drums drowned the voices of those deputies who protested, and the hall was emptied without bloodshed. The Council of the Ancients remained alone ; they deferred the executive power to three provisional consuls, Bonaparte, Siéyès, and Roger-Ducos, and charged two commissions of twenty-five members each to revise the constitution (November, 1799).

The Revolution abdicated in favour of military power and entered with it on a new phase. At home, thanks to the order which reigned everywhere, the new ideas had taken root in a way which no power could prevent. Abroad, thanks to the conquests of the French soldiers, the new principles spread over Europe like the victories of France. After having floated over nearly all the capitals of Europe, the flag dropped, mutilated, bloodstained, into the strong hands of a powerful genius who came to seize it. The 18th Brumaire began that long chain of prosperity, of glory, of unheard-of power, but also of mistakes and lamentable reverses, which form the history of the consulate and of the empire.

From another point of view it was a trial of strength. What lessons were given to the world in these perpetual insurrections of the commune, the convention, the directory, the councils, even the army! How could France produce law-abiding citizens, striving to modify the law by wisdom rather than to destroy it by anger, when for the last ten years nothing had been done save by sudden and passionate outbreaks of violence ?

End of the 18th Century.—Some days after this military revolution the eighteenth century came to an end. It had been a century of passionate discussion, at once sceptical and credulous, gentle and ferocious, of foolish customs and of a spirit that was often frivolous. But it had yet given to the world the great idea, that society, like mankind, must be constantly improving itself; it was a century which gave a hand to all the pariahs of the law, of the state, even of nature. Serfs, negroes, heretics, aliens, the infirm—all were helped and cared for. Solicitude for them was nothing but a heritage bequeathed by the century. Whatever may have been its faults, much will be pardoned to this century "which in the material world created sciences by the help of which man gained an unforeseen domination over nature, a domination which strangely increased his wellbeing; a century which in the moral order conquered tolerance, sought out justice, proclaimed the law, claimed civil equality, recommended the brotherhood of mankind, banished the cruelty of penal institutions, dismissed arbitrary methods from public administration, made reason the guide of intelligence, liberty the guide of government, progress the ambition of the people, law the sovereign of the world."

CHAPTER LXIII

THE CONSULATE (NOVEMBER 10, 1799, TO MAY 18, 1804)

Constitution of the Year VIII.—Siéyès, who with Bonaparte had been responsible for the 18th Brumaire, had a constitution all ready; he proposed it. It was cleverly calculated to reconcile the monarchy and the republic, having neither the despotism of the one nor the agitations of the other. But its complicated machinery was not suitable to the society of these days, which wished to feel itself under a firm government; neither was it acceptable to General Bonaparte, who had the genius and the force to draw France out of the chaos in which she found herself. Siéyès' plan was therefore abandoned, at least as far as regarded the organisation of executive power, which was the chief consideration, and on the 15th December the "Constitution of the year VIII." was promulgated.

The Roman system was followed: there were consuls, senators, tribunes, prefects; soon there would be an emperor. There were three consuls elected for ten years and re-eligible,

but the first alone had the prerogatives of power, the two others were only for purposes of consultation. These three consuls were Bonaparte, Cambacères, and Lebrun.

Council of State, Tribunate, Legislative Body.—In the three assemblies of the *Constitution* and the *Convention* executive power had been subordinated to legislative power. Now the contrary was to be the rule. The laws were prepared at the command of the first consul by a *Council of State*, of which the members, named by the consuls, could be dismissed by them. The laws were next discussed by the *Tribunate*, composed of 100 members, passed or rejected by the *legislative body*, which consisted of 300 deputies. The tribunate explained the laws made or proposed, the abuses to be corrected, the ameliorations to be introduced, etc.; the course which the government should take or should not take into consideration. When a law, after having been examined by the tribunes, was taken to the legislative body, where three councillors of state, orators of the government, were ready to defend it, three orators of the tribunate came to uphold or condemn it. No other member of the legislative body had the right to intervene in the debate. The vote was taken in silence like a national grand jury on a cause which had been debated by both sides.

Thus in defiance of *executive* power the convention had divided it in creating five directors. Now, in defiance of *legislative* power, the "Constitution of the year VIII." divided it in giving the initiative of the laws to the government, the discussion to the tribunes, the vote to the legislators.

The Senate Conservator.—There was a body between the executive and legislative powers, the *Senate Conservator*, composed of eighty members appointed for life. They saw to the maintenance of the constitution, judged all the acts contrary to the organic law, and chose from the national list the members of the tribunate and the legislative body.

Electoral power still existed but was transformed. All Frenchmen of twenty-one years of age who were inscribed on the public registers were electors; the electors of each communal district chose a tenth part of their number to draw up a list of communal notabilities; it was from this list that the first consul chose the public functionaries of the district. The citizens on the communal list next named a tenth of their number, to form the departmental list, from which the first consul chose the functionaries of the department. A tenth of those on the departmental list formed the national list. All those comprised in this

list could be raised to national functions of a public nature. It was from the third list of notabilities that the senate elected the members of the tribunate and the legislative body. The assemblies which discussed and voted the laws were thus the result of an election of four degrees. It was only a phantom of representative government; the least discerning could recognise behind this transparent shadow of liberty the hand of the dictator.

The senators had 25,000 francs of annual endowment; the tribunes 15,000; the legislators 10,000.

Submitted to the approbation of the people, the "Constitution of the year VIII." was accepted by 3,011,107 votes against 1567.

Administrative Reorganisation.—To achieve the work of the constitution, numerous organic laws were necessary. The first consul hastened to propose them to the tribunate and the legislative body. One of the most important was that which constituted the department after the pattern of the state itself. The departments were administered by elected directors on whom central power had little influence and who left to themselves made little effort. The office of intendant was revived under the Roman name of prefect; all executive power was concentrated in the hands of this individual who was directly responsible to the minister of the interior. As well as the intendant in the *Council of the Prefecture* there was a departmental Council of State and as well as the *General Council* there was a legislative body which, if it did not make the law, at least explained the desires of the department. The *under-prefect* had also a *District Council;* the *Mayor* of each commune had a *Municipal Council*. So that in all the action was reserved to one person, the deliberation to several: that was right and good.

Each district or under-prefecture had a civil tribunal, and for finance a special receiver, each department had a criminal tribunal and a receiver-general. Twenty-five tribunals of appeal were spread over the country and a Court of Cassation maintained the uniformity of the jurisdiction. This administrative organisation of France was the completion of a work begun by Louis XIV. pushed by centralisation to its furthest limits; in its general features it had survived all the revolutions of France. Ten governments had fallen, but the idea of a sovereign state had ever risen from their ruins, and by whatever name those were called who held the power, local liberty had always been suppressed or maintained without force. This excessive centralisation resulted in the need of founding the national unity

of France; it became an urgent necessity when, by reason of her geographical position and the hatred of foreigners, France was obliged to take up a combative position. Liberty perished, and many of the misfortunes of France arose from the fact that Paris, where the political life was concentrated, could impose her will, her caprices, and her revolutions on the whole country.

Efforts to Reconcile and Abolish Parties.—On leaving the first council held after the 18th Brumaire, Siéyès had said, "Gentlemen, we have a master." But if the minority, who like himself saw the dictator already in the toga of the consul, if the royalists and the Jacobins, who dreamt of two impossible things, are excepted, the whole of France hailed with satisfaction the news of these strong measures and the words of Bonaparte: "Let there be no more Jacobins, moderates, or royalists; let all be Frenchmen!" The provisional consuls showed by their first measures a great spirit of conciliation. The proscripts of the Fructidor, Carnot, Portalis, Simeon, etc.; the conventionals, Barrère and Vadier, were recalled; the law of hostages and that which established progressive taxes were annulled; the priests detained for refusing to take the civil oath were set at liberty. A storm had wrecked some emigrants on the coast of Calais and the law condemned all emigrants found on the soil of the republic to death. Bonaparte gave them their liberty. He did more, he closed the list of emigration and declared the ex-nobles eligible for public employment, at the same time guaranteeing their property to the purchasers of national lands (*i.e.* those who had bought the lands formerly held by emigrants, lands which had been confiscated and sold by the state). At the same time, in the name of the liberty of worship, he reopened the churches.

To the astonishment of the incredulous this powerful man of war showed himself a consummate administrator. In a few days he had touched everything, and to everything he touched he gave new life. This provisory government, where before there had always been a definitive government, had so quickly inspired commerce with confidence that the bankers of Paris lent the merchants the first capital of which they had need. And the armies, whose misery was extreme, had received relief. The country was cleared of the bands of robbers which infested it, and the revolutionary agitations of the south were appeased. The royalists—who had hoped, in spite of the events of the 13th Vendémiaire and the 18th Fructidor, that Bonaparte was working for Louis XVIII., and that the sword of the constable would satisfy his own ambition—deceived in their hopes, had raised

in the west the flag of insurrection. Bonaparte by energetic measures suppressed this new civil war. D'Autichamp and Sussanet made their humble submission to him (January 17, 1800). Georges Cadoudal capitulated and went to England. But in defiance of the press, which with good laws and a firm resolve to carry them out is really no danger and may often be a help and counsellor, Bonaparte suppressed a great number of papers. Thirteen only were allowed to appear in Paris and they were warned that at the first slip their fate would be the same as that of their fallen contemporaries.

The armies, owing to all they had suffered and all they had accomplished for the republic, included many republicans in their ranks; both soldiers and generals had much to complain of in the negligence of the directors; one stroke of the pen which freed them from those "lawyers and gossips" had been warmly welcomed. Bonaparte was actively occupied in reorganising and relieving the intense misery which decimated their numbers. Moreau, who had accepted the strange office of guarding the directors imprisoned in the Luxemburg whilst Bonaparte went to St. Cloud to terminate the Revolution, received in recompense the command of the united armies of the Rhine and of Switzerland. Masséna was not considered so sound; he was taken from the scene of his recent successes and relegated to the command of the Italian army, the distress of which was beyond words.

Marengo (June 14, 1800).—The day after the "Constitution of the year VIII." had been put in action, the first consul, breaking with all former traditions of diplomacy in order to make an impression on the public, had written the following letter to the King of England:

"Sire, called by the wishes of the French nation to occupy the first magistracy of the republic, I think it wise, on taking up this charge, to negotiate directly with your majesty.

"Must the war which has for eight years ravaged the four corners of the globe go on for ever? Can no understanding be arrived at?

"How can the two most enlightened nations of Europe, so strong and powerful that their security and independence do not admit of doubt—how can they sacrifice to a mistaken idea of greatness the wellbeing of commerce, of internal prosperity, of the happiness of family life? How is it possible that they do not feel peace to be the first of their needs as it is the first of their glories?"

This letter was both dignified and able. Bonaparte wrote in

similar terms to the Emperor of Germany; but Austria, who held and counted on holding the whole of Italy, and England, who did not wish on any account to leave Malta and Egypt to France, rejected these overtures; the first in moderate terms, the second with a violence of speech which showed the hatred of her first minister, William Pitt, for France.

Bonaparte was therefore obliged to make war. He had been content to win public opinion by his moderation, but if it had to be war, then it would be a glorious and decisive war. In Italy Masséna had only 36,000 men against 120,000 Austrians under Baron Mélas: he was overpowered by superior forces and a part of his army was thrown back on the Var; with the rest, 15,000 to 18,000 men, he shut himself up in Genoa and sustained that memorable siege which, after that of Zürich, is the brightest star in his military crown. He held the siege for more than two months, till the 4th of June, when the Austrian army captured him, losing in the operation more soldiers than were altogether in Masséna's army. But great things were going on elsewhere, rendered possible by his heroic defence. The Austrian line of operations stretched from Strasburg to Nice; but Switzerland was in French hands, thrust like a coin into this line and opening it to the blows of the French. In deceiving the enemy as to the movements of their army, the French were able to emerge either from the Upper Rhine valley behind Marshal Kray or from the Alps behind Baron Mélas. Bonaparte conceived this double design, but Moreau, as far as he was concerned, only executed half of it. He succeeded nevertheless in crossing the Rhine and concentrating his forces near Schaffhausen where he beat the Austrians under Kray at Stokach, Engen, and Moesskirchen, and threw back the Austrian forces on the entrenched camp of Ulm. While he held them hemmed in, Bonaparte, by one of the greatest strokes of war which had ever yet been executed, himself crossed the Alps.

In order to arrest Mélas who threatened the Var, and Kray who threatened the Rhine, the first consul had made public announcement of a reserve army of 60,000 men at Dijon. Spies of foreign powers hastened to that town, where they found a few invalids instructing a handful of conscripts; they published abroad that the reserve army was a stratagem of war to intimidate the Austrian generals and retard their progress. But the reserve army did exist; it was being formed on all the roads of France with isolated bodies of men in La Vendée, Toulon, Marseilles, and Paris; they received munitions, horses, guns, and uniforms as

they marched slowly along the roads, without noise or disturbance, towards Geneva and Lausanne. By the beginning of May all the army corps were in Switzerland, and Bonaparte, following the movements of Mélas from the Tuileries, movements which led him further and further into Liguria, saw the very circumstances which he had predicted come to pass. One day before leaving, leaning on the maps and putting signs of different colours to mark the positions of the French and Austrian troops, he said to his astonished secretary: "That poor M. de Mélas will pass Turin on his retreat towards Alessandria. . . . I will cross the Po, I will meet him on the way to Piacenza on the plains of Scrivia, and I will beat him there. . . ." In saying these words he put one of his marks against San Giuliano on his map. The campaign was prophesied in advance.

He left Paris on the 6th of May, passed through Dijon and hastened towards Geneva. Marescot, a general of great military genius, had been charged to make a reconnaissance of the Alps. He pronounced in favour of crossing by the Great St. Bernard, but he considered the operation a very difficult one. "Difficult? So be it," replied the first consul. "But is it possible?" "I think so, on condition of extraordinary efforts." "Good," replied Bonaparte, "let us go." The cannon were dismounted and put on sledges with small wheels; the gun-carriages were taken to pieces and, with the munitions and all the baggage, slung over the backs of mules, for there were ten leagues impracticable for vehicles to be traversed.

The crossing of the pass commenced on the night of the 14th of May. An advance-guard of six fine regiments commanded by Lannes left at midnight. They had to make the ascent before sunrise, on account of the avalanches, more frequent in the heat of the day. It took eight hours to reach the convent of the Great St. Bernard. The troops found provisions there which the first consul had sent on in advance and which the monks distributed to them. After a short rest the descent of two hours was made to the village of St. Remi, where the road recommenced. On the following days divisions, gun-carriages, munitions, crossed the pass. The guns, especially those of large calibre and the howitzers, offered great difficulties. They were laid in the hollowed trunks of fir-trees; a hundred men were required for each of these sledges; in the most difficult places music would cheer them or the call to charge would be given; everything crossed successfully. But an unforeseen obstacle arrested the army. Lannes, marching by the Ivrée, found the way barred by an

impregnable fortress, that of Bard. All efforts to take it proved futile ; the first consul himself came. He recognised the impossibility of taking this rock, but had it surrounded by a double footpath on which the infantry and cavalry could cross over. As for the artillery, there was no way for it to pass except by this fort. The path was covered with straw and dung, the cannon were rolled in tow, the gunners dragged them along, and this dangerous place was passed at dead of night, and that under the enemy's guns. There were 40,000 men in Italy ; 20,000, who came by another route, were to join them. In 1796 Bonaparte had gone round the Alps ; in 1800 he crossed them, and this time with great hopes of an immense and speedy success, for he had established himself by this manœuvre on the rear of Mélas ; he had cut him off from Austria ; he had alarmed him by his audacity ; he had vanquished him before he met him.

Mélas was in the most profound ignorance of these movements, and for long he refused to believe in them. At last he could no longer doubt the truth of the reports, when he heard that Bonaparte had entered Milan in the midst of wild enthusiasm and universal admiration. Mélas then concentrated his forces as rapidly as possible to escape being surrounded. On the 9th of June he threw himself upon Lannes at Montebello, but was not able to break through. Three attempts on Piacenza, to take possession of the bridge over the Po at that town, were equally unsuccessful. Hemmed in between the river, the Apennines, and the French army, he decided to give battle on a large scale. It took place not far from Alessandria, near to that village of San Giuliano which Bonaparte had fixed at the Tuileries as the scene of his victory, and near the village of Marengo, whose name it has immortalised.

The encounter of the two armies was terrible, desperate. Bonaparte had not all his forces at command, for, to prevent Mélas from escaping, he had been obliged to dispose his troops in a vast net-work around him, behind the Tessin, towards the Apennines, and near Piacenza. There were three battles on that day. The first took place at a quarter to ten in the morning between Lannes and Victor, with 15,000 men against 36,000. It was lost. The French, retreating under the fire of 200 cannon and the pressure of an immense force of cavalry, abandoned the village of Marengo. Bonaparte arrived at that moment with his consular guard. He placed 800 picked grenadiers in the middle of the plain, formed in a square, like a living citadel. By their murderous fire they stopped the cavalry

flung against them for some time. But they had to retreat to reform and concentrate. Lannes took two hours to travel three quarters of a league. Mélas thought he had gained the victory, he re-entered Alessandria, leaving his chief of staff to complete the destruction of the enemy, and dispatched couriers to all the cabinets of Europe with the good news.

At three o'clock in the afternoon the second battle was lost. But Desaix—detached the evening before to look for the enemy, who was not then known to be at Marengo—had heard the frightful cannonade; he stopped; then understanding at once that the duty of a lieutenant is to hasten to the fire of his general, he returned, and appeared on the field of battle with his division at the moment when the Austrians, formed in close formation, were endeavouring to reach the road to Piacenza, their only path of safety. Then Bonaparte began the third battle. "My friends," he said to his soldiers, "that is enough retreating; you know that it is my habit to sleep on the field of battle." And he flung Desaix with his 6000 fresh troops on the front of the Austrian column, while the rest of the army attacked the flanks. Desaix, whose loss can never be sufficiently deplored, fell at the very outset, killed by a bullet in the chest. But his soldiers threw themselves with the more fury on the Austrians to avenge him. Kellermann charged at the gallop with his squadrons. Marmont suddenly unmasked a battery of large guns. The Austrian column, shaken at its head, was broken in two halves. One of them was taken, the other was thrown into disorder. The panic spread to the Austrian cavalry; soon all had fled and Mélas was reduced to surrender. Italy was reconquered (June 4, 1800).

Hohenlinden (December, 1800).—If Moreau had not met with such brilliant success in Germany, he had at least kept the offensive and forced the Austrians to quit their entrenched camp at Ulm in menacing by the victory of Hochstadt their line of retreat. Moreau penetrated as far as Munich, so that Austria, who had no longer an army in Italy, was held in Germany, powerless to arrest the French. Austria decided to treat; but England intervened with her subsidies, and the cabinet of Vienna prolonged the conferences of Lunéville. Bonaparte resolved to conquer peace by a winter campaign. Moreau received orders to recommence hostilities on the 28th of November, to cross the Inn and march on Vienna, while Macdonald was to emerge from the Grisons into Tyrol; Brune was to force the Mincio and the Adige. Everything seemed hopeful.

In Italy, Brune forced the Austrians to recross the Adige;

Macdonald, descending on their territory by the Splügen Pass, threatened their communications. During these operations, 6000 French or Cisalpines seized upon Tuscany, ruled by an Austrian prince, and Murat drove the Neapolitans from the pontifical states.

The situation in Germany portended great events. Moreau commanded a magnificent army of 100,000 men splendidly organised. He was at Munich holding the line of the Isar, while the Austrians at Braunau held the line of the Inn. A great forest stretches between these two rivers, and the village of Hohenlinden occupies a clearing in the centre of it. These wooded slopes inclining to the north and descending to the Danube by successive terraces, terminate in low and marshy ground. The two generals took the offensive at the same time, both by their right: Moreau directed Richepanse to attack Wasserburg where he had to cross the Inn; the archduke proposed to turn the French line by surprising Moreau when he attempted to cross the lower Isar. But the Austrians had not foreseen the difficulties in their way; they found so many obstacles that in the midst of their operations they stopped and resolved to resort to the high terraces of which we have spoken, while the principal mass of their army should march direct on Hohenlinden through the forest.

If Moreau had held—as Bonaparte knew so well how to do—all his forces at hand or near him, he could easily have destroyed his adversaries; but he could only command 50,000 men against 70,000. He did beat them, thanks to the able forethought which drew the enemy into a labyrinth, thanks most of all to the boldness of Richepanse who threw himself with the utmost bravery and dash into the centre of the enemy, crowded together in long columns in the forest. Richepanse divided these columns, established himself in the gap he had made, stopped the enemy on the one side, and on the other forced him towards Ney, who attacked the head of the column. The results of this brilliant victory were 8000 killed or wounded, 12,000 prisoners, 87 guns. Six days later Moreau crossed the Inn, then the Salza, the Traun, and seized Lintz on the Danube, Steyr on the Ens. He was at the gates of Vienna. Austria stopped him in promising to accept the conditions of France.

Peace of Lunéville (February, 1801).—Two months after the Battle of Hohenlinden peace was signed at Lunéville. The emperor accepted the basis of the Treaty of Campo-Formio, which gave the left bank of the Rhine to France and threw

Austria back behind the Adige. He recognised the Batavian, Swiss, Ligurian, and Cisalpine republics, the last of which was to possess the valley of the Po from the Sesia and the Tanaro to the Adriatic. He also recognised the new kingdom of Etruria formed by the Spanish branch of the house of Parma at the expense of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, the brother of the emperor (February 9, 1801).

The court of Naples, threatened by the army of Murat, promised hastily to close its ports to the English, and received French garrisons at Otranto, Taranto, and Brindisi. France already had troops at Leghorn and Ancona; Italy was therefore entirely at her disposal. Spain was busy trying to force Portugal, by an invasion, to desert the English alliance. The czar, struck by admiration for the first consul, offered his friendship. And so in fifteen months France, reorganised at home, had broken the second coalition and imposed peace on the continent.

Unfortunately the new Italian states had no strength in themselves. They required the hand of France to protect them against Austria, which still ruled at Verona and Venice. Forced to intervene constantly beyond the Alps, the first consul found it simpler to make of Italy another France. These aspirations and encroachments brought on another war. Could he have acted differently? Doubtless he could, since Chauvelin sixty years later showed that the solution of this difficult problem was to be found, where France has now found it, in the greatness of the house of Savoy. A historian of French imperial diplomacy called the Treaty of Lunéville "the origin of all our misfortune as well as of all our glories."

Continuation of Hostilities with England.—England alone was obstinate in her enmity. Abandoned by Austria, she still made war, thinking herself unassailable. But it was coming to be understood why this power, which gained wars when all other powers lost them, refused to lay down arms. The ideas which had caused the northern states to arm against her 20 years earlier reappeared in the councils of kings. The Czar Paul I., gained by the adroit flatteries of the first consul, who had ceded him the island of Malta at the moment when the English took it; the King of Prussia to whom, on the morrow of the Brumaire, Bonaparte had sent his aide-de-camp Duroc with friendly overtures; the Kings of Sweden and Denmark, whose commerce England molested, whose flag she insulted—all these had renewed the armed league of neutrals (December 16, 1800). England replied by putting an embargo on all the ships of allied powers which

were then in her ports, and on March 21, 1801, Admirals Nelson and Parker forced the passage of the Sund to engage in a battle under the walls of Copenhagen, a battle bravely sustained by the Danes. To spare their capital the horrors of a bombardment they signed an armistice. This audacious action and the death of the Czar Paul I., assassinated in his palace by his courtiers, put an end to the league of neutrals. Alexander, son and successor of Paul I., abandoned his policy, and France found herself alone to defend the liberty of the seas. But the English, with their 195 ships of the line and their 250 frigates, had such a superiority of forces afloat, that far from being in a position to fight them, France was not even able to send help to Malta which the English were blockading, or to Egypt which they threatened.

Loss of Egypt.—Kleber, to whom Bonaparte had confided the government of his conquest and of the army in Egypt, was an excellent general. But being of a morose and critical nature he was not great except when in danger. The idea of being left, abandoned in Egypt, irritated him profoundly; not only did he make the mistake of allowing himself to become disheartened and depressed, but he allowed the same spirit to dominate the army. The talk was soon only of getting away from Egypt at any price, and the unexpected appearance of a Turkish army of 80,000 men, led Kleber to sign the convention of El-Harish with the English commodore, Sidney Smith. By this convention the French troops were to be taken back to France on English ships. The British cabinet, deceived by this discouraged spirit, disavowed their representative, and declared that the army might find its way back as best it could. Kleber found his energy at once. He completely destroyed the Turks at the bloody battle of Heliopolis (March 20, 1800), recaptured Cairo, which had been in insurrection, and re-established by vigorous measures the domination of France in Egypt. But he fell by the knife of an assassin the same day on which Desaix was killed at Marengo (June 14).

The command passed to the hands of General Menou, an able administrator but an incapable general. He allowed the English to disembark on the peninsula of Aboukir to the number of 10,000 men, attacked them too late and with inferior forces (March 21, 1801). The defeat of Canope (April 9) constrained him to cede Cairo and Alexandria. France had occupied Egypt for three years when this unfortunate convention compelled her to evacuate it (September 2, 1801).

Peace of Amiens (March, 1802).—It was a great success for

the English ; another had preceded it, the capitulation of Malta, after a blockade of 26 months. But England was groaning under the weight of a debt of 12 milliards and the misery to which the working classes were condemned by the high prices and scarcity of provisions. Abroad she viewed with alarm the rebirth of the French navy under the powerful impulse of the first consul. Gantheaume with a full squadron had twice scoured the Mediterranean with impunity. Rear-Admiral Linois, in view of Gibraltar, engaged in the fine fight of Algeciras, where with three ships he had defeated six and destroyed two. Finally, and this was more serious, Bonaparte was preparing at Boulogne an immense fleet of gun-boats for a descent on England and the victor of Aboukir charged with burning these "nut-shells" had met with a check. Fear silenced for a moment the rancour of the English aristocracy and on March 25, 1802, the Peace of Amiens was signed. All the continental acquisitions of France, all the republics founded by her arms, were recognised. England restored the French colonies, gave Malta to the Chevaliers of St. John, the Cape to the Dutch ; she kept nothing but the Spanish island of Trinidad and Ceylon.

The news of the Treaty of Amiens was received in France and in England with unmixed joy. Peace with the continent had never been anything but a truce : the true peace was that which led England to recognise the greatness of France. Bonaparte had said after the 18th Brumaire, "The Revolution is finished." Now it was of the wars of the Revolution that it was said, "They are at an end." The first consul was of that opinion. "At Amiens," he said at a later period, "I thought in all good faith that the fate of France and of Europe seemed settled ; war finished, I would have given myself solely to the administration of France ; I think I should have brought forth prodigies."

Glorious Administration of Bonaparte: The Concordat (1801).—The prodigies had already begun ; Bonaparte was at the height of his glory. For the second time he had given France a glorious peace. Egypt was lost, Malta also, and an expedition to enforce the authority of the home country on the negroes of St. Domingo had come to nothing. But these distant disasters hardly awakened an echo in France. They were forgotten at the sight of the growing calm of the different parties, the rebirth of order under the firm and able hand of the first consul. He gave again to industry the powerful impulses of Colbert, in persuading France to produce for herself that which she might no longer buy from England. The division of the large domains sold as national

property gave small pieces of land to those who had never before possessed land of their own, and agriculture doubled its production. Commerce was encouraged, in spite of the system of protection extended every day by the increase of duty; finance was reorganised; the Bank of France established; the budget, for the first time in a century, balanced; roads and bridges were repaired, arsenals filled. At Paris three bridges were built across the Seine: that of the *Arts*, and those which afterwards received the immortal names of Austerlitz and Jena. Between the valleys of the Somme and the Oise the canal of St. Quentin was dug; between France and Italy the Simplon route was made; those of Mont Cenis and Mont Genevra were contemplated, and hospices were founded on the summits of the Alps. The civil code was closely studied; the project of a powerful organisation for public instruction—the university—was elaborated; that of a great institution for national recompense was founded—the Legion of Honour.

A marvellous activity, an unheard-of power for work, made Bonaparte see everything, understand everything, do everything. Arts and letters received sympathetic and welcome encouragement. A stranger to the rancour of the last ten years, he recalled the emigrants by an amnesty, giving at the same time renewed security to the buyers of national property; he recalled the priests, rebuilt the altars, and signed with Cardinal Consalvi, legate of Pius VII. (July 15, 1801), the *Concordat* by which he thought to have established religious peace. After this famous treaty France was divided into ten archbishoprics and fifty bishoprics; a salary payable by the state was substituted for the ancient territorial endowment of the clergy. The government had the charge of worship, the nomination of the bishops and archbishops; but the pope alone had the right of giving them canonical institution. Bonaparte inaugurated this "religious peace" with great pomp in Notre-Dame. Chateaubriant in his *Génie du Christianisme* had prepared for this restoration of Catholic worship.

After this manner the first consul strove to overcome hatred and rally all parties to one sentiment—that of the greatness of France. In chaining the Revolution to his chariot he was acting up to the principles of his code, that is to say, he was making it imperishable. Unfortunately from day to day the master showed himself more and more; he could hardly brook contradiction. To aid the senate—transformed into a sort of superior power to the constitution—he broke the power of the legislative body

and the tribunate in eliminating those of their members who showed themselves contrary to his government, Chénier, Daunou, Benjamin Constant, and others ; as much as to say that the rest had better hold no opinion save that of the chief of the state. Some men like Siéyès, De Tracy, Garat, Cabanis, kept up the custom of appealing in all things to principle, a custom they had brought from the previous century and from the constitution. Bonaparte treated their metaphysic with sarcasm, called them by the name of *Idealogues*, and reserved power and honours for those who served him well without discussion. His injustices, committed in the name of the public peace, must be acknowledged; also his lively intrigues, his prompt determinations, his powerful initiative which pointed all his life to government concentrated in his own person. These did not disturb many people ; as there was order as well as glory, far from being irritated by this adjournment of liberty, the country repeated with Bonaparte that " France had escaped from slavery and anarchy." France congratulated herself that she had found such a powerful genius to control her destinies.

The Infernal Machine (December, 1800).—While these sentiments of gratitude and confidence were being heard on all sides, the incorrigibles of the extreme parties, having given up hope of success for their policies in any other way, had recourse to the horrible and cowardly expedient of assassination. The republican plot of Aréna and Céracchi, in which the police were deeply implicated, was frustrated (October, 1800). But Bonaparte nearly perished by an infernal machine which exploded in the rue St. Nicaise when he was on his way to the opera. Fifty-two people were killed or wounded. That was the work of royalists. The government attributed it to the Jacobins and 130 of them were deported ; the real authors of the outrage became known later on and were punished by death.

The Consulate.—Attempts of this sort had the effect of confirming what they had sought to overthrow. Every one held it necessary for France to prolong the power of him who was threatened by the parties ; all considered that the Peacemaker of Europe deserved some national recompense—the more fitting that it was so obvious, so useful to the country—which would make it possible for him to allow his great projects to ripen. Shortly after the Peace of Amiens, the senators having proposed to prolong for another term of ten years his consular powers, the people gave him the consulate for life, with the right of choosing his successor (August 2, 1802).

In order to put the institutions in harmony with the new rights accorded to the first consul, the "Constitution of the year VIII." was revised. The lists of notabilities were suppressed and replaced by colleges elected for life. The senate, invested with constituent powers, obtained the right of regulating by a *consulting senate* everything not dealt with by organic laws: the right of suspending a jury, of dissolving the legislative body and the tribunate, of putting the departments outside the law of the constitution. A privy council composed of consuls, ministers, two senators, two counsellors of state, and two high officers of the Legion of Honour had to be consulted on the ratification of treaties and was entrusted with the revision of the organic consulting senate. The tribunate, reduced to fifty members, was nothing but a section of the Council of State. We have forgotten, as all the world had forgotten, the two other consuls, silent witnesses of the government of their colleague. Like him they were elected for life; that did not make them the less obscure. The *Organic Consulting Senate* of the Constitution of the year X. was adopted by 4,568,885 votes to 3,577,259. Among the number of negative votes was that of Masséna.

External Policy of the First Consul: Changes in Italy (1802).—The republics which owed their being to that of France modified their constitutions after her example. The Cisalpine republic had already made Bonaparte president of their government (January, 1802); the Ligurian republic asked him to choose their doge. This influence of the first consul in Italy was accepted by the foreign powers as a consequence of the victories of France. The reunion of France and Piedmont, which formed seven new departments (September, 1802), the occupation of the Duchy of Parma and the Island of Elba, were foreseen and were effected without opposition, though not without exciting murmurs of anger. It was the inauguration of a policy absolutely contrary to that of the first assemblies of France, a policy which was to be fatal to her.

Mediation in Switzerland (1802).—The Swiss were engaged in deplorable agitations. Bonaparte, invoked as mediator by the government of that country, sent them 20,000 men who re-established material order; he also gave them a constitution in which Europe could only admire his wisdom (February 9, 1803). The ancient alliance of France with the cantons was renewed, and 16,000 Swiss entered the service of France. Unfortunately, Bonaparte added to this moderate mediation arrogant and threatening words against England.

Intervention in Germany.—Bonaparte's intervention in the more complicated affairs of Germany was as animated, and for France much more unfortunate. German diplomacy was constrained, it is true, to renounce its proverbial slowness and to keep in step with the young conqueror, who conducted negotiations as he conducted battles. Indemnities had been promised to the German princes who had lost their domains on the left bank of the Rhine. The clergy furnished the wherewithal. The three ecclesiastical electorates were secularised and the powerful bishops and rich abbeys—relics of the Middle Ages—which belonged to the principalities were given to the dispossessed princes. Imperial towns lost their ancient privileges, to come under the authority of a prince. The chaos of Germany was simplified ; it was much more so after Austerlitz and Jena. But Germany saw clearly at that time what was for her own interest and found that she had been put by the hand of France on the path to that unity which was for France the cause of all her misfortunes.

Expedition of St. Domingo.—The first consul had promised to build up the French navy and her commerce ; he was naturally led to the thought of raising up again her colonial empire. In the first place he made a politic sacrifice. He sold Louisiana to the Americans for 60 millions and he justified this act when he was reproached for it by these profound words : "It is necessary in the interests of France that America should be great and strong. I read further than you into the future ; I prepare myself avengers." And the Americans would have taken up this rôle in 1812—if he had waited for them.

St. Domingo, the queen of the Antilles, which before 1789 had exported 160 millions of produce, was no longer in the hands of France. The liberal doctrines of the constitution, thrown without precaution into the midst of this flourishing colony, had caused incalculable misfortunes : the negroes had massacred the white population and the island, covered with blood and ruins, had returned to barbarism.

The first consul wished to recover the richest jewel of the ancient colonial empire of France. He sent, under the command of his brother-in-law, General Leclerc, considerable forces against the negro Toussaint l'Ouverture, who, named by him governor of St. Domingo after his victory over the mulattoes, declared himself to be independent and called himself the "Bonaparte of the blacks." The capture of this remarkable man was the only success of an inopportune expedition which

profoundly irritated England and the members of which were seized and decimated by yellow fever. Christophe and Desselines, successors of Toussaint, favoured by the rupture between England and France, drove the French from the island and founded the republic of Haiti (1804).

Rupture of the Peace of Amiens (May, 1803).—England had made peace in order to stop the growth of France and France grew more in peace than she had done in war. Her commerce and her industry took an immense flight; her flag reappeared on all seas, and seemed to offer serious competition to her who called herself "Mistress of the Seas." And France intervened with authority in Germany and Switzerland. Holland was under her direction. Piedmont had become one of her provinces; it seemed that upper Italy was about to form another. And so it was said, "The ambition of the French is not satisfied with what were but lately her natural frontiers. She has crossed the Alps, she has overflowed into Italy; soon she will cross the Rhine and her other barriers." England recriminated against every act of the external policy of France, acts which were either accomplished or foreseen when England had signed the Peace of Amiens; she was making a pretext for retaining Malta, the key to the Mediterranean. Bonaparte demanded this restitution, the principal condition of the treaty. The English minister answered him by one of those undignified violations of the right of nations, of which one finds too much in the history of England: without declaration of war he seized 1200 French and Batavian ships on all seas (May 13, 1803).

Plot of Cadoudal and Pichegru: Death of the Duke of Enghien.—The two enemies not being able to reach each other, they had to content themselves in the meantime with reprisals. Bonaparte arrested all the English travelling in France; interdicted the entry of English merchandise into French ports; sent garrisons to the sea-coast towns of the kingdom of Naples; and laid hands on Hanover, a continental possession of the King of England. Then he returned—this time with the serious intention of carrying it out—to the project of crossing over from Calais and conquering peace in London itself. England stirred up the whole continent to raise enemies against France. She alarmed Russia, Austria, and Sweden; tried to embroil Prussia, which for eight years had been an ally of France; and joining wilful murder to legitimate warfare, she financed the conspiracy of Georges Cadoudal and of Pichegru, in which Moreau allowed himself to be implicated. Cadoudal went to Paris with some of his *Chouans*

to assassinate the first consul and re-establish the Bourbons. The police prevented this crime, and the victor of Hohenlinden was to be seen, his face red with shame, sitting as his accomplice beside the leader of the *Chouans*. Pichegru strangled himself in his prison ; Moreau was condemned to two years' imprisonment. Cadoudal, the Counts of Rivière and of Polignac, with seventeen others were condemned to death ; only two were executed along with Cadoudal. Josephine and Murat succeeded in obtaining pardon for MM. de Rivière and Polignac. Moreau secured remission of his sentence. He was exiled to the United States and did not return till 1813 to direct the last coalition.

Another tragedy preceded this one. The Duke of Enghien, the last of the Condés, was carried off from the Castle of Ettenheim in the Grand Duchy of Baden, taken to Vincennes, delivered to a military commission, and the same night condemned to death and shot in the moat. The duke denied any knowledge of Cadoudal's plot ; but he would not have stayed four leagues from the French frontier except to profit from some event prepared in Paris the exact nature of which may not have been revealed to him. He admitted having been several times to Strasburg, and the law concerning emigrants who had taken up arms against France was applied to him (March 20, 1804). He was protected by the right of nations because he was not taken during an action of war nor on French territory. His death was an infamous reprisal. The first consul, surrounded with assassins from London, " sent terror back to the Bourbons, even in London itself." " In similar circumstances," he wrote in his last testament, " I would act in the same way again." He deceived himself, or rather he wished to deceive posterity, for he knew very well that the condemnation of the Duke of Enghien had deplorable consequences. The violation of the law cost more power than it seemed at the time to give. Prussia, ready to enter into an alliance with France, turned away towards Russia ; that day the coalition renewed its bonds, already twice broken.

CHAPTER LXIV

REIGN OF NAPOLEON I. TILL THE PEACE OF TILSIT (1804–1807)

Proclamation of the Empire.—The glorious soldier of Arcola and Rivoli, the first general of the republic, had aspired to govern France, a country which the directory had either not governed at all or had governed badly, and of which he had been the leading force on the 18th Brumaire. Elected first consul for ten years, his brilliant services had gained him the recognition of the country, and when factions directed against him an infernal machine and the assassin's knife, France in protesting against these criminal attempts continued his decennial functions for life. This power which was entrusted to him for good he wished to retain for his family. And France was not disposed to allow the title to which he had given such honour and security to fall into other and less capable hands. So that when the attempt of Georges Cadoudal was frustrated France responded to the plots of the royalists by offering Bonaparte the empire. The whole tribunate, with the exception of Carnot and one or two others, expressed the wish that Bonaparte should be made hereditary emperor. The senate proclaimed him under the name of Napoleon the First, and the people by 3,572,329 votes to 2569 established a new dynasty which, born of the Revolution, would preserve its principles. "My spirit," said Napoleon, in taking the title of hereditary emperor, "my spirit will be no longer with my descendants on the day when they cease to merit the love and confidence of this great nation."

Organic Consulting Senate of the Year XII.—A consulting senate modified the consular constitution. Heredity was established in favour of the descendants of the male line of Napoleon or of his adopted sons. Should he have no descendants, natural or adopted, the crown should pass into the line of Joseph, failing him to that of Louis, two brothers of the emperor. Absolute authority was attributed to the emperor and to the imperial family. His brothers and sisters became princes and princesses. The civil list was fixed at 25 millions; the endowment for each prince at one million.

To give this new throne the brilliance of the old courts, it was surrounded with a new aristocracy, richly endowed and carrying

great titles. It was desired to place between the monarchy and the people this regulated hierarchy, this intermediate body, as Napoleon called it, which seemed indispensable to the monarchic institution. There were first the great dignitaries of the empire, the great elector (Joseph Bonaparte), charged with convoking the legislative body, the senate, the electoral colleges, etc.; the arch-chancellor of the empire (Cambacères) who had charge of supervising generally the judicial order; the arch-chancellor of the state with a similar rôle in connection with diplomacy; the arch-treasurer (Lebrun) of finance; the constable (Louis Bonaparte) for the army; and the grand-admiral for the fleet. These great dignitaries, in the case of a minority, would form the council of the regency; in the case of extinction of the dynasty they would elect an emperor.

Below these six grand dignitaries—of whom only four were appointed at first, in order to leave two places vacant for brothers of Napoleon then in disgrace—there were forty or fifty grand officers of state, appointed for life like the great dignitaries.

There were sixteen marshals of the empire, of whom fourteen were chosen at once; Jourdan for his victory at Fleurus; Masséna for Rivoli, Zürich, and Genoa; Augereau for Castiglione; Brune for Bergen; Berthier for his eminent services at the head of the General Staff; Lannes and Ney for a long series of heroic actions; Murat for his exceptional valour at the head of the French cavalry; Bessière for the command of the guard, which he had held since Marengo; Moncey and Mortier for their warlike virtues; Soult for services rendered at the camp of Boulogne, and to the Swiss at Genoa; Davout for his conduct in Egypt; and finally Bernadotte for his military fame, but chiefly on account of his connections (Bernadotte had married Eugenie Clary, daughter of a merchant of Marseilles and sister of the wife of Joseph Bonaparte). There were also four honorary marshals, who being senators, had no more active service; Kellermann for Valmy; Lefebvre for his devotion on the 18th Brumaire; Perignon and Serrurier for the respect they justly inspired for the army.

Songis and Marescot, inspectors of artillery and engineers; Gouvion St. Cyr, colonel-in-chief of the cuirassiers; Junot of the hussars; Marmont of the hunters; Baraguey d'Hilliers of the dragoons; and finally Admiral Bruix, inspector-general of the coast on the ocean, and Vice-Admiral Decrès, inspector-general of the shores of the Mediterranean—these closed the list of the great military officers. The great civil officers comprised

Cardinal Fesch, the uncle of Napoleon, grand almoner; Talleyrand, grand chamberlain; Berthier, grand huntsman; Caulaincourt, grand master of the horse; Duroc, grand master of the household. A grand master of ceremonies, the Count of Ségur, had charge of instructing the new court in the ways of the old.

The senate was composed of 80 members elected by the senate itself along with the six grand dignitaries, the French princes of eighteen years of age and over, and finally those citizens called by the emperor. The senate thus constituted maintained the prerogatives given to it by the constitution of the year X. The legislative body voted the laws beforehand, without discussing them; speech was allowed on condition that it was not used except in secret committees. The tribunate became more and more a sort of council of state. There being no special reason for its existence it was suppressed in 1807.

A high imperial court was instituted to deal with plots against the safety of the state or the person of the emperor, with faults committed by ministers or their agents, the members of the imperial family or the grand personages of state. It was composed of sixty senators, twenty counsellors of state, grand officers of the empire, and so on.

The new constitution, as far as regards outside forms, was representative, seeing that it was created for the most part by election, and that the deputies of the country voted the taxes and made the laws. But regarded as a whole, with a wide impartial view, it was absolute; for it is not the wheels which make the force of the machine, but the power imposed on it by the human will. And so in 1804 the will of France was that of Napoleon; France gave her fortunes into the hands of this extraordinary genius who up till now had showed his power only by his services; who could still render service by defending the Revolution against the implacable rancour of England and against the old monarchies of the continent. But if it was natural for France to be thus attracted and carried away, was it not the duty of the chief of the state to moderate and control her enthusiasm? Would it not have been useful for him to have preserved some of that political liberty which had been abused, but the desire for which is always at the bottom of the heart? Napoleon did not find in the senate, in the legislative body, in the aristocracy which surrounded him one man who dared to contradict him in his prosperity; would he find any one to support him in the days of misfortune?

The Coronation (December 2, 1804).—Accustomed to appeal

to the imagination by brilliant spectacles, Napoleon had resolved to astonish France and the world by an imposing ceremony. He obtained from the pope that with which no king or emperor had hitherto been honoured; the pontiff himself came to Paris to consecrate this new Charlemagne (December 2, 1804). Pius VII. put the Holy Oils on the head, arms, and hands of the emperor, but when he would have taken the crown to put it on his head, Napoleon seized it and crowned himself; then taking that of the empress, he crowned her also; Josephine burst into tears, perplexed by the triumphant fortune which her husband bore so proudly.

The Legion of Honour.—From the day when Napoleon replaced the republic by the monarchy, he dreamt of reconstituting the nobility; he did not carry out this great project till after the triumphs of Austerlitz, Jena, and Friedland. Ten years earlier he had decreed the institution of the legion of honour, a system of national recompense such as the spirit of equality could accept, because it created no hereditary privileges in marking out for public esteem the scholar, the industrial benefactor, and the soldier, who had deserved well of their country by their works, their activities, and their courage. On the 14th July, 1804, the anniversary of the fall of the Bastille, Napoleon distributed in the *Hôtel des Invalides* the highest decorations of the order to the principal personages of the empire. On the 16th August he himself gave to the soldiers of the camp at Boulogne the cross which had replaced the *armes d'honneur* formerly given by the republic in recognition of deeds of heroism. It was a splendid military festival, such as the world had never seen. One hundred thousand men, heroes of twenty battles, were ranged round the imperial throne which had been erected on a natural rising ground, descending in a gentle slope to the shore. From there one saw the ocean; the English fleet which barred the Channel; and far away, hidden in the mist, that England which all longed to invade, to which a favouring breeze and six hours of good fortune could carry the French. A division of the fleet from Havre entered the harbour at this moment; the English to trouble its voyage engaged in a lively cannonade, and it was to the familiar sound of the enemy's guns mingled with warlike fanfares that officers and soldiers, nobles of old families or sons of peasants, came forward to receive this cross, bought with their blood.

Napoleon, King of Italy.—The Italian republic, constituted after the pattern of the French republic, followed its vicissitudes

to the end. Italy, enervated by secular servitude, by divisions which dated from the downfall of the Roman Empire, could not now, if left to herself, either defend or unite her different provinces. Were the hand of France—which had protected her for eight years—withdrawn for a moment, Austria would seize on some town or district; should the hand of Napoleon, which held her united, be taken away, she would fall back into her unceasing rivalries. "You have only local laws," Napoleon said to the deputies of the Cisalpine republic, "you require general laws." He meant to say that Italy was nothing but an assembly of incoherent and envious municipalities, enemies to each other; that Genoa being jealous of Turin, Venice of Milan, Bologna of Florence, every large town insisting obstinately on having its own special independent existence, resulted in the fact that there was no communal or national life; no unity, no state. This unity, which Italy now knew, she could cultivate under the friendly instruction and enlightenment of France. Many Italians understood that, and when the empire was proclaimed at Paris, the monarchy was established at Milan (March 18, 1805).

The Italians were glad to accept the defence of France, but they did not like the appearance of being in subjection. Napoleon entered into their feelings and offered the crown of the kingdom of Italy to his brother Joseph who refused it. He therefore took it himself; but in order not to offend too deeply those powers which were alarmed at the reunion between Italy and France, he declared that in the interests of peace he would give this kingdom to a French prince. Eugène Beauharnais, son of the Empress Josephine, was sent as viceroy to Milan. And so Napoleon was Emperor of France and King of Italy: as mediator of the Swiss confederation he had Switzerland already under his influence and Swiss regiments in his army. Austerlitz was to make him protector of the confederation of the Rhine. He would then very nearly have reconstituted the empire of Charlemagne; his generals asked him if he would not like to be known by the title of *Emperor of the West:* a grandeur which was his downfall—the downfall of France.

Camp of Boulogne.—The continent was silenced in the face of this Revolution which had already put two crowns on the head of a soldier. England alone braved its anger safe behind that impassable barrier, the British Channel. But Napoleon having only England for his enemy, could apply the immense resources of his genius to the project of the invasion of her shores. Not many days had passed since the rupture of the Peace of Amiens

when an activity long since unknown reigned in the ports of France. The class of ships being built were small and low ; gunboats, flat-bottomed boats, pinnaces, all for sail or oars, were thought to be sufficient to carry the expedition. The work went forward not only in the ports but also in all those rivers from which boats could descend to the sea. At Paris eighty gunboats were put on the stocks along the Seine, launched and taken to Havre, where, joined to other divisions, they were equipped, armed, and sailed along the coast towards Calais. Squadrons of cavalry and light artillery followed their course along the shore ready to protect them against an attack from the enemy. Similar fleets came from the Loire, the Gironde, the Charente, and all the ports of the coast. Twelve to thirteen hundred ships assembled in this way, and concentrated at Boulogne and its neighbouring ports, Étaples, Wimereux, and Ambleteuse, which Napoleon had specially deepened for the purpose. One hundred and fifty thousand men were gathered in the proximity of these ports, and, like the Roman legions, exchanged their arms for pick-axes, working to hollow out the channels to the sea. In order that they should not be disturbed in their work, Napoleon invented various means to keep the enemy at a distance. He established lines of submarine batteries armed with big guns which were covered at high tide, but laid bare at low-water ; so that their fire seemed to advance and retreat with the sea itself. Five hundred guns of large calibre were put in batteries on the cliffs which the English called the " coast of iron " ; forts constructed in the open sea prevented the enemy from approaching the ports. Many of these batteries fired hollow projectiles, of which one alone, exploding on the hull of a ship, did irreparable damage. From the winter of 1803, the preparations were far enough advanced, the sailors and soldiers sufficiently trained, for Napoleon to fix the date of the invasion. The conspiracy of Cadoudal and Moreau and the proclamation of the empire turned his attention for a short time from the camp at Boulogne, but he returned to it with new energy as soon as the questions raised by that great change had been solved.

He had many different possibilities to choose from as to crossing the Strait : he might cross in a calm which held the English fleet motionless ; after a storm which had chased it from the Channel ; under cover of night and the thick fogs of winter ; or thanks to a combination of circumstances which would make the French fleet, if only for a few hours, the superior force in the Channel. This last chance would have been the best.

Napoleon made his preparations in profound secrecy and with marvellous ability. Admiral Villeneuve, who had sailed from Toulon with all the forces of that port, was to pick up on his way the Spanish squadron of Admiral Gravina at Cadiz, then to sail to the Antilles, create some disturbance there, and so attract Nelson, who was guarding the Mediterranean. Before having been caught up Villeneuve was to return towards Europe when thought to be on the way to make some great conquest of India, raise the blockade of Ferrol's squadron, then the blockade of Brest, and finally enter the British Channel with fifty ships, which would remain in command of these waters till such time as the English admiralty could reunite her scattered fleets on all seas. But before that could be accomplished, the French fleet would have crossed, and with it 150,000 soldiers and the chance of the world.

At first everything succeeded according to desire: Nelson, who kept a watch on Toulon, was deceived. When, after having lost some time in looking for the French fleet, he pursued it to the extremity of the Gulf of Mexico, Villeneuve returned to Europe; but he allowed himself to be delayed off Cape Finisterre by a battle with Admiral Calder. The issue was uncertain, if anything rather to the advantage of the French admiral, who had only lost two inferior Spanish ships. He could have continued his voyage and accomplished Napoleon's plan. But he had not the courage and returned to Cadiz to repair his damages; there he was blockaded.

At the moment when this magnificent plan was wrecked, Napoleon learned that English gold had formed a new coalition. Enraged, he left the sea for the land and began the immortal campaign of 1805.

Campaign of 1805: Capitulation of Ulm (October 19).—Four attacks were prepared against the empire. The Swedes and Russians were about to advance by way of Hanover; the Russians and Austrians by the valley of the Danube; the Austrians alone by Lombardy; the Russians, English, and Neapolitans by the south of Italy. Of these four armies, Napoleon disregarded two; those which were placed at the two extremities. He held the third in charging his ablest lieutenant to stop with 50,000 veterans the 80,000 Austrians which the Archduke Charles thrust on the Adige; he reserved all his strength for the fourth, 80,000 men whom General Mack, preceding the great Russian army and the reserves of the Austrian army, conducted across Bavaria and Swabia, towards the defiles of the Black

Forest. Napoleon turned that army, and repeating the miracle of Marengo, he fell, by way of Franconia, on the rear of Mack's forces, cut them off from Vienna, surrounded them, trampled upon their detachments at Wertingen, Gunzburg, and Elchingen, where Ney defeated them, and finally surrounded them at Ulm. It was on the 25th of September that Napoleon's great army had entered Germany; on October 6 it had crossed the Danube; on the 19th, the Austrian army, hemmed in by a circle of iron and fire, surrendered. In three weeks an army of 80,000 men had disappeared. Some thousands fled towards the Tyrol and Bohemia, but 50,000 had been killed or taken prisoners: 200 guns and eighty flags were left in the hands of the French. What rendered these magnificent results still more glorious was that they had been assured by the foresight of genius, and were fulfilled practically without loss. "The emperor," said the soldiers, "does not make war any longer with our arms but with our legs."

Trafalgar (October 21).—The news of a great naval reverse came to depress the emperor. The very day on which Mack left Ulm, Admiral Villeneuve lost to Nelson the sanguinary Battle of Trafalgar, which cost the combined fleets of France and Spain 18 ships and 7000 men. The English had 3000 killed, of whom Nelson was one—a loss more regrettable to England than if she had lost an army. This defeat was the death-blow of the imperial navy. Napoleon no longer counted on it, and despairing of coming to a hand-to-hand fight with England, he was the more driven towards the thought already in his mind, of ruining his unassailable enemy by closing the continent to her.

Battle of Austerlitz (December 2, 1805).—But Napoleon proceeded with his march on Vienna, which was now unprotected. He entered the capital on November 13 and found himself between two armies; on the right, that of the Tyrol and Italy which Ney and Masséna were driving before them and which was about to be brought to a halt under the Archduke Charles behind the line of the Raab; on the left, the great Austro-Russian army with the two emperors. This army occupied Moravia; Napoleon hastened his forces towards it, crossed the Danube, and arrived at Brunn on November 20 with 65,000 men. In three months his soldiers had marched 500 leagues.

Ninety thousand Austro-Russian troops were ranged on the heights of Austerlitz. Their leaders had conceived a magnificent plan: to turn the right wing of the French, cut them off from the road to Vienna and from their reserves, to overwhelm them

or at least thrust them back into Bohemia, where it would b easy to complete their destruction with the aid of Prussia, wh was arming and only waited for a success to hasten with 60,oc men to the final dispatch of the French. But Napoleon had for seen their intentions as if he had been at their councils, and h pretended to be working into their hands. He only sent inadequat forces, one division of the corps of Davout, to his right win towards the villages of Telnitz and Sokolnitz, to draw the enem in offering him the temptation of blocking the road to Vienn which passed behind these hamlets. But he established himse strongly on his left, he sent cavalry to guard the road to Olmut resting them on Mont Bosenitz and the top of the Santon whic covered the artillery and protected a regiment he had trysted b oath to defend that position to the death. Lannes was in con mand. In the centre, behind the river Goldbach and facing th plateau of Pratzen, Napoleon put Soult with three divisions, an further to the rear in the same direction a formidable reserve 25,000 men. The Russians were massed on the plateau Pratzen, on the plain to their right was the corps of Bagratic and a large body of cavalry under orders to trample Lannes an the other French regiments under the feet of their horses. Th castle of Austerlitz, the headquarters of the two emperors, wa only guarded by a reserve of 10,000 men.

The enemy fell blindfold into the trap. Three Russian divisio came down from the heights and engaged in an unequal bu furious fight towards Telnitz and Sokolnitz, defended only b one regiment and a battalion, Friant's division being still fa in the rear towards Gross-Raigern, although it had advance thirty-six leagues in two days. While the enemy were engage on this flank and, having taken the villages, thought they ha practically decided the issue of the day, Napoleon, who ha with great difficulty restrained the impatience of his soldier hurled 25,000 men on to the plateau of Pratzen, the key of th position, annihilated the Russian Imperial Guard whic defended it, cut the enemy forces in two, and set again on th three divisions sent to turn the French right. Davout's me attacked them in front, subjected them to a fierce fire, force them back on the frozen ponds which surrounded the plai broke the ice with a million bullets under the feet of multitud of Russians who sank and were drowned. At the same tin Lannes had engaged in a furious battle on the left; he brave all the efforts of the enemy's cavalry, which, decimated by h fire, could not withstand the shock of Murat's squadrons an

was thrown back in disorder, with the remains of Bagration's force, on Austerlitz (December 2, 1805). "Soldiers," said Napoleon in one of those proclamations which were both the announcement and the recompense of victory: "Soldiers! I am proud of you. You have decorated your eagles[1] with immortal glory. . . . Return to your homes, it will be sufficient for you to say, 'I was at Austerlitz' for your hearers to rejoin, 'There is a brave man!'"

Fifteen thousand dead, ten thousand prisoners, two hundred and eighty guns—these were the losses of the enemy. The two emperors fled; the Emperor of Austria demanded an interview with Napoleon at the outposts: an armistice was granted. The Prussian emperor, alarmed, hastened to renounce the intentions he had cherished and treated with Napoleon. To put difficulties in the way of Napoleon's turning towards England, the emperor offered him Hanover in exchange for the duchy of Cleves, the stronghold of Wesel on the Rhine, and the principality of Neuchâtel in Switzerland.

Treaty of Pressburg (December 26): Confederation of the Rhine.—Austria did not sign the peace treaty till December 26 at Pressburg. She abandoned the Venetian states, Istria and Dalmatia, which Napoleon reunited to the kingdom of Italy; also Tyrol and Swabia which he used to enlarge the domains of the Dukes of Bavaria and Würtemburg, who took the title of king, and that of the Duke of Baden, who took the title of grand-duke. Austria lost four million subjects and a revenue of fifteen million florins. By the cession of Venice she lost all power over Italy, by that of the Tyrol all influence over Switzerland. The arsenals of Vienna had given over to the French army 100,000 muskets and 2000 big guns. The "column of the great army" was made of the bronze taken from the enemy in this campaign and was erected at Paris in the Place Vendôme.

The Treaty of Pressburg consecrated the emperor after Austerlitz just as the Peace of Lunéville had crowned the consul after Marengo. It gave France a magnificent position. Prussia was driven back from the Rhine; Austria was pushed back from Italy. The German princes who separated France from Austria had received lands and titles from the hand of France—lands and titles which they had never dreamt of possessing. And so Napoleon, achieving in peace the results of war, constituted some months after Austerlitz the Confederation of the Rhine.

[1] The eagle was the standard of the French under Napoleon, a device which he had copied from the ancient Romans.

The old germanic empire, constituted by Charlemagne, was dissolved after existing for six centuries. Francis II. gave up the title of Emperor of Germany (August 6); to prevent his prestige from falling he had already adopted the title of Emperor of Austria. But now a great number of the 370 states into which Germany was divided, and which had entered on continual anarchy, were suppressed by, and for the advantage of, the more powerful princes of western and central Germany. These princes reunited, under the protection of France, in a new federative state which was called the *Confederation of the Rhine*. Prussia and Austria, partly Slav nations, were excluded. It was a benefit for Germany and a happy thought for Europe to place between these three great military states this confederation which prevented their frontiers from touching. France must for ever regret that the emperor did not hold to the Treaty of Pressburg so happily conceived for the peace of Italy and Germany as well as for the greatness of France.

Royal Vassals: Great Military Fiefs: The New Nobility.—But already Napoleon was occupied with other thoughts. This sceptre of Charlemagne's which he had wrested from the hands of Germany he wished to keep for himself, especially as the interests of Europe and of France demanded that it should never be broken. Hardly were the 120 flags conquered in that three months' war hung from the arched roof of Notre-Dame, the Hôtel de Ville, and the Palace of the Senate, when he drove the Bourbons from Naples and completed the system of the empire in surrounding it by monarchies in vassalage and feudatory principalities. Joseph Bonaparte was created King of Naples and Sicily; Louis Bonaparte, King of Holland; Elisa, sister of Napoleon, became Duchess of Lucca; the beautiful Pauline Borghese, his other sister, was made Duchess of Guastalla; Murat the husband of Caroline Bonaparte, Napoleon's youngest sister was made Grand-Duchess of Berg; Berthier was given the sovereign principality of Neuchâtel; Talleyrand that of Benevento; Bernadotte, brother-in-law of Joseph Bonaparte, that of Ponte-Corvo.

Napoleon reserved twelve duchies in the Venetian states four in the kingdom of Naples, two in the duchies of Parma and Piacenza, one in that of Lucca. These he distributed successively to his companions in arms and his most devoted servitors. The two former consuls, Lebrun and Cambacères, became in this way the Dukes of Piacenza and Parma; the ministers Gaudin, Fouché Champagny, and Maret became the Dukes of Gaëta, Otranto

Cadore, and Bassano. The chief judge Regnier became Duke of Massa; the Grand-Marshal Duroc, Duke of Friuli; the Marshals Soult, Bessières, Victor, Moncey, Mortier, Macdonald, and Oudinot became Dukes of Dalmatia, Istria, Belluna, Conegliano, Treviso, Tarento, and Reggio; the Generals Caulaincourt, Clarke, Savary, and Arrighi, Dukes of Vicenza, Feltre, Rovigo, and Padua, etc. In these duchies—which were all created outside of France in order not to injure the national spirit of equality—part of the public revenue was assured to the titular chief, but no political power; it was thus not a complete return to feudalism.

In order to have recompenses at hand for all classes of society, Napoleon retained 34 millions of national property, 2,400,000 francs income in the different states of Italy; and after the campaigns of Prussia and Poland, twenty millions in Polish property, thirty in Hanover, and five or six millions of the revenue of Westphalia. He was thus able to distribute princely gifts to his generals, to his ministers, to his soldiers. Every general of a division had before him, as a recompense for his services, an endowment and the title of baron. The colonels looked forward to either the one or the other. Thus a new nobility, of plebeian origin, but which had found its parchments on the field of battle, grew up around this crowned soldier, who sought to reconstitute the aristocracy, that it might take its place round the throne on which he was seated. That was a deviation from the principle of equality. But Napoleon gave no privileges to this aristocracy. It had no advantage over the rest of the citizens except in its titles and its honours. In order to make it lasting and to maintain its brilliance, he established primogeniture; but the spirit of the country did not follow him there; and outside of these *perpetual entails* constituted by the emperor, there were only *212* constituted specially, and they only represented a revenue of less than two millions.

Prussian Campaign (1806).—The success of Austerlitz had been the death-blow of William Pitt, the implacable enemy of France; he was succeeded by Fox, a man of open mind and noble spirit. On hearing this, Napoleon hoped to be able to conclude a peace with England. But unfortunately Fox died, and power returned to Pitt's disciples, partisans of war to the death. A treaty was about to be signed by the Russian ambassador in France. It was disavowed. An English politician was in Paris, the conferences were delayed, hints were thrown out of the restitution of Hanover to England, which Napoleon had recently

promised to Prussia, and the court at Berlin was thrown into a panic which led to imprudent resolutions.

Napoleon wanted a great continental alliance. Austria had been too profoundly humiliated in the last ten years to take her into consideration; Russia had been forced since Austerlitz to recall her vanquished soldiers and she demanded too much in return for her alliance; she herself could only half fulfil it. It was with Prussia that Napoleon wished to unite his fortunes, but since the campaign of 1805 that vacillating court—which thought itself still the court of Frederic the Great while it had only a feeble king and an imprudent queen—inspired in Napoleon neither esteem nor confidence. The evening before Austerlitz Prussia prepared her armies to attack the rear of the French forces; the next day she stretched out her hand. The emperor plainly saw through her hostile intentions. On receiving the congratulations of the Prussian ambassador in the camp at Austerlitz: "There," said Napoleon to his officers, "there is a compliment of which fortune has changed the address." Nevertheless, after he had created the Confederation of the Rhine in the south-west of Germany, he engaged with Prussia to form a similar confederation in the north, to be placed under his patronage. But Prussia, who had deceived him, thought she was now being deceived herself. She thought that peace with England could only be made at her expense, and to prevent an injury which she had not the slightest cause to fear, she threw herself with inconceivable levity into the most dreadful peril. The Austrian army was only mentioned in Berlin with disdain; it was said that the victories of Napoleon over these incapable generals would find their term before the old Duke of Brunswick, a pupil of the great Frederic. The queen, beautiful and romantic, showed herself on horseback in the midst of the troops, excited their courage, led the court and her husband to the abyss that yawned before them. "One seems to see *Armide*," said the *Moniteur* of France, dryly, "who sets her own palace on fire." A new coalition was formed. Russia promised two armies, who were three months on the way; England promised subsidies and Sweden her feeble support. Napoleon left Paris on September 26. His great army of 130,000 incomparable soldiers was still stationed in Germany. In a few days he concentrated them at Bamberg; on October 8 they were in motion. Two Prussian armies, instead of guarding strongly the line of the Elbe, had crossed that river and manœuvred with clockwork regularity, following the tactics of text-books, behind the forest of Thuringia.

Napoleon repeated again the manœuvre of Marengo and Ulm; he turned the left of the Prussians as he had turned the right of the Austrians the preceding year; established himself in the way of their communications between their armies and the Elbe, which was their line of retreat, and struck the same day two terrible blows at Jena and Auerstadt (October 14).

Jena and Auerstadt (October 14, 1806).—There were some preliminary fights: at Schleitz on the 6th, at Saalfed on the 10th. In the last of these encounters Prince Louis of Prussia, one of the authors of the war, was killed by a hussar. Already confusion reigned in the Prussian army. The old Duke of Brunswick was terrified that he would end his military career in the same way that Mack had done. When Napoleon threatened the crossing of the Saale at Jena, at Dornburg near Auerstadt, the duke, instead of accepting battle on ground that was favourable to him, imagined it would be better to retreat to Magdeburg on the lower Elbe. He ordered Prince Hohenlohe, who had 70,000 men under his command, not to accept battle; but it was too late: in such close proximity to Napoleon nothing escaped him. The Prince of Hohenlohe had to improvise the attack at Jena, when he waited for the French from the opposite side, near the forest of Thuringia, and lost in a few hours 12,000 killed or wounded, 15,000 prisoners, and 200 guns.

While Napoleon was gaining this victory, prepared by such brilliant strategy, another splendid fight was being fought at Auerstadt, four leagues away, by Marshal Davout. This great warrior had only 26,000 men at Naumburg to guard one of the principal crossings of the Saale, and had orders to hold this position at all costs. The Duke of Brunswick arrived to cross the river with 60,000 Prussians. Davout, abandoned by Bernadotte, who out of jealousy refused to support him, boldly barred the way to the Prussians, resolving to allow himself and the last man of his corps to be killed rather than allow the Prussians to cross. It was like one of Napoleon's Egyptian battles. The Prussians had a cavalry of 15,000 horses, reputed to be the best in Europe. Twenty times they were thrown at the French squares, not one of which allowed itself to be broken; the squares in their turn deployed in attacking columns, intimidated the enemy infantry, threw it into disorder, and forced it to retreat. The Duke of Brunswick, the Marshal de Mollendorf, and General Schmettau were mortally wounded; 10,000 men killed or wounded covered the field of battle; 115 guns remained in the hands of Davout, who had himself only possessed forty-

four. "If it had only been necessary to fight with our arm against these Frenchmen," wrote a Prussian officer, "we woul soon have beaten them. They are small, pitiful creatures, on of our Germans could fight four of them. But under fire the become superhuman. They are carried along by an unutterabl ardour, of which we find no trace in our soldiers. . . . What ca one expect from our peasants who are taken into battle by th nobles and share in their danger, but who know they can neve share in their feelings nor in their recompense?" Thus were th French described by those whom they had vanquished; in thei praise of the bravery of France we see also praise of the Revolu tion.

The two Prussian armies fled in indescribable confusion. Ha the ground resembled that on which Mack had fought, the would have been captured; but in the great plains of norther Germany it is not possible to manœuvre in the same way as i the valley of the Danube. The French troops, above all Murat' cavalry, pursued them, crossed the Elbe, and hurried to th Oder to intercept the Prussians. The Prince of Hohenloh wounded at Prenslow, was forced to lay down his arms; Blüche had the same fate at Lübeck. Of the 160,000 men who marche so lately to attack the French, 25,000 were killed or woundc 100,000 were taken prisoners, 35,000 were scattered, withou one recrossing the Oder. Magdeburg, Spandau, Custrin, an Stettin, all the strongholds of the Elbe and the Oder, were occu pied by the French. In one month (October 8 to November 8 the Prussian monarchy had ceased to exist. Napoleon ha entered Potsdam, where he had taken as his share of the boot the sword of Frederic the Great, which had been laid on hi tomb. He had also been at Berlin where he did himself honou by an act of clemency. In a letter, which was intercepted, th Prince of Hatzfeld, left as civil governor of the town, reveale to Blücher the position of the French troops. It was an act c treason punishable by the laws of war with death. Napoleo ordered that he should be given over to a council of war. Rapp Caulaincourt, and Savary confined the prince in the castle. Th princess, shunned by them, threw herself at the feet of th emperor. "Do you recognise the writing of your husband?" he asked. Dismayed she did not know what to say. "Wel well, madame," said Napoleon, "throw this piece of paper int the fire and the military commission, having no proofs, will no be able to condemn."

The Continental Blockade (1806).—From the day when Napo

leon was obliged to abandon the camp at Boulogne, he had constantly thought of how to conquer the sea from the land. Austerlitz had given him Italy and the Adriatic, that is to say, half the European coasts of the Mediterranean; Spain and Turkey added to his alliance would give him the rest. Jena assured him the northern seaboard and a portion of the Baltic coasts. One step further and he could entirely close the continent to the commerce of England. He could cause these islanders, whom he could not reach, to perish of plenty amidst the heaped-up merchandise of the world imprisoned in her harbours. This step Napoleon decided to take; he resolved to march from the Oder to the Vistula, to occupy the mouths of all the great European rivers. And as England, with a monstrous extension of the rights of war, had announced the blockade of the coast from Brest to Hamburg, which prevented the approach of vessels belonging to neutral powers, Napoleon promulgated on November 21, 1806, the famous *Decree of Berlin*, which declared the British Isles themselves to be in a state of blockade. In consequence, all commerce with these islands was formally interdicted; English goods, in some places where they were found, were confiscated; all English arrested on the continent were detained as prisoners of war; all letters coming from or going to England were destroyed. Thus the tyranny of England on the seas led the emperor to establish the same tyranny on the continent. In this struggle of giants, the interests of the ordinary people disappeared and the right of nations was trodden under foot by both sides.

But for this system to be successful, to strike at the heart of England and oblige her to demand mercy, it was necessary that not one continental port should remain open to her. After having closed the ports of Prussia, it was necessary also to close those of Russia, that is to say, for Napoleon to become master over all. The continental blockade was a gigantic machine of war which was sure to inflict a mortal wound on one of the two adversaries. Napoleon was killed by it.

Eylau (February 8, 1807).—In one of the splendid addresses Napoleon made to his soldiers, which were called the "Bulletins of the Great Army," he said to them: "Soldiers, one of the great powers of Europe, a power which dared but lately to propose a shameful surrender to us, has been annihilated. The forests and valleys of Franconia, of the Saale and the Elbe, which our fathers took seven years to traverse, we have covered in a few days; we have entered Berlin, covered with the glory

of our victories. The Russians boasted of coming to us, we saved them half the way. They and we, are we not the soldiers of Austerlitz?"

On the 28th November, Murat entered Warsaw: Napoleon arrived on December 15, waiting for a general rising in Poland to proclaim the re-establishment of that kingdom, so imprudently destroyed in 1773. The Poles, on their side, waited to begin their rising till Napoleon was thoroughly engaged with them. But the emperor hesitated; so far from the Rhine, which was the base for his operations, he feared that Austria might throw her forces on the flank of his army. This great question was therefore in suspense, Napoleon counted on no one but himself. Already 120,000 Russians were on the Narew, the western tributary of the Vistula. To separate them from the sea, whence they were receiving help from England, and from the Prussians who guarded Dantzig and Koenigsberg, Napoleon engaged with the Russians, towards the end of December, at Czarnovo, Golymin, Soldau, and Pultusk, in a series of combats which, and especially the last, were marked by sharp fighting and cost 20,000 men and eighty guns. But on the heavy clay soil, cut up with woods and marshes, which an unexpected thaw had changed into a liquid bog, movements were difficult and slow. Napoleon could not follow up his advantages. He had to stop and take to winter quarters which were admirably disposed in front of the Vistula and between the Bug, the Narew, the Orezyc, and the Ukra, like a great entrenched camp.

In placing himself so far from Dantzic, of which he hoped to make a siege during the winter, Napoleon purposely offered the Russians the temptation of crossing the Vistula below his encampments, then he hoped to draw them on into his clutches and drive them into the sea. Benningsen, the Russian generalissimo, did in fact conceive this idea, and hoped to take the French by surprise in mid-winter. He transported all his forces to the left of the French encampments. But Ney was there. Advised by his couriers, whom he sent far afield, to within view of Koenigsberg, the marshal gave the alarm to all his troops. Bernadotte arrested Benningsen at Mohrungen; the emperor was already manœuvring to cut him off, when the despatches containing the order of march revealed to Benningsen the danger by which he was menaced. He was able to retire. But Napoleon pursued him relentlessly, defeated some of his divisions at Wallersdorf, Hoff, Heilsberg, and obliged him to halt at Eylau to engage in a great battle.

The Russians had 72,000 men. The emperor had not been able to muster more than 54,000 and those harassed, tired, and famished with hunger. It was a winter's day, the 8th of February, thick snow covered the ground, sudden gusts of wind and whirls of snow cut the faces of the soldiers. The business of the day commenced by a veritable cannonade. Two hundred French and more than three hundred Russian guns belched forth shot and death on the two armies. Napoleon waited at the foot of a tree in the cemetery of Eylau under a rain of missiles that passed above his head, till Davout, whom he had called to him, fell on the left flank of the Russians. When Napoleon heard his cannons, from the direction of Sarpellen, he launched Augereau's forces on the centre of the enemy. But the Russians unmasked a battery of large-calibre guns which in a few moments laid low 4000 of the French army. The rest of this division fell back on Eylau, the enemy followed them and came almost to the cemetery, the key of the French position, where Napoleon had only six battalions to guard him. At his order, Murat hastened to him. "Will you leave us to be devoured by these creatures?" asked the emperor. Murat gathered eighty squadrons, and at the gallop pierced the first line of the enemy, slaughtered them, and threw his force on the second line. But this line, resting on a wood, unmasked yet another formidable battery which fired broadcast on all which lay before it, friends and enemies alike. General Hautpoul was mortally wounded by a cannon-ball; disorder broke out among the cuirassiers. Seeing this, General Lepic charged at the head of his grenadiers of the guard; scouring the plain in every direction he achieved the destruction of the first Russian line, which proceeded to re-form. A portion of this line, 4000 grenadiers, advanced once more as far as the cemetery; a battalion of the guard, without waiting to load their guns, rushed at them with the bayonet and levelled them to the ground. In the meanwhile Davout's attack was making progress: Ney approached on the other wing with his army corps: Benningsen, reduced to 40,000 men, decided to retreat. He had lost 30,000 men, killed, gravely wounded, or taken prisoner, 24 guns, and 16 flags. The French on their side had lost 3000 killed and 7000 wounded.

This dreadful butchery was not the victory Napoleon was in the habit of gaining; it was estimated almost as a defeat; and Benningsen, while in flight himself, boasted of having beaten the French. The solidity of the Russian infantry, the disproportion of numbers, the derangement of Napoleon's plans by

the unexpected attack of the Russians explained the sma results of this sanguinary affair.

Friedland (June 14, 1807).—The great army, disturbed for a instant in its repose, retired after giving this lesson to the enem and approached its new camp near Dantzic to cover the siege that stronghold. General Chasseloup, a military genius, und the orders of Marshal Lefebvre, reduced it to capitulate on Ma 26th. Further in the rear, Vandamme and Jerome Bonapar achieved the conquest of Silesia.

The summer campaign was short and decisive. The army le its central camp on the 1st of June to encamp in divisions. O the 5th the Russian generalissimo believed he could still surpri and carry off the army corps of Ney at the extreme right of t imperial army, and attacked. But all had been foreseen ; proud retreat on the part of Napoleon's lieutenant and the rap concentration of the whole army disconcerted the plans of t enemy. Obliged in his turn to retreat, he was driven, close followed, along the Alle, defeated at Heilsberg and intercept at Friedland on the way to Koenigsberg, the great city which wished to protect. Lannes with 26,000 men against 82,000 barr his passage and held him from three in the morning till midda defending with terrible slaughter the wood of Sortlack, t plateau of Posthenen, and the village of Heinrichsdorf by whi the enemy's route lay. At last the emperor arrived with t rest of the army. It was the anniversary of Marengo ; Napoleon face was radiant with hope and genius, for he found the Russia in a position to which his manœuvres had driven them and which he could inflict on them an overwhelming disaster. T River Alle cut their army in two ; they had thrown four bridg across it and occupied the little village of Friedland before t river. The emperor, simulating an attack all along the line b giving serious attention only to the right, threw Ney on Frie land. "That man is a lion," he cried, on seeing the intrep soldier attack under a rain of shot, capture the town, and c or burn the bridges. Then the centre and the left were engage the Russians were driven to the Alle and on into the river : was half-past ten at night, and Lannes had commenced t action at three o'clock in the morning. Eighty guns had be captured, 25,000 Russians had been killed, wounded, or drowne the rest fled in the greatest disorder. Koenigsberg, the last to of the Prussian king, surrendered; immense supplies of provisio were found there, 100,000 muskets sent from England, who ga arms and money, but did not dare to land a single regiment.

Peace of Tilsit (July 8, 1807).—But this astute policy commenced to turn against those who practised it with so much profit and so little danger. Whilst Austria, Prussia, and Russia lost their provinces, their armies, their honour, the English ranged the seas, sweeping everything before them; they seized the colonies of Holland and Spain: the miseries of the continent made their fortune. "I hate the English even more than you do," was one of the first remarks of Alexander at the Tilsit interview on the banks of the Niemen. "In that case," replied Napoleon, "peace is made." After long and intimate conferences between the two sovereigns, peace was signed on July 8, 1807. The emperor gave up to the King of Prussia, Pomerania and Brandenburg (that is, old Prussia and Silesia) with the exception of Dantzic, which was declared a free town, and the great fortress of Magdeburg on the Elbe, which was left to the French. Of Hesse-Cassel and the Prussian possessions west of the Elbe Napoleon constituted the kingdom of Westphalia for his brother Jerome. The Polish provinces of Prussia he formed into the grand-duchy of Warsaw, which he gave to the King of Saxony. These two new states joined the Confederation of the Rhine.

These were only half measures. Prussia, reduced by a half, to five million souls, was either too much weakened or too little. She could no longer be a useful ally for France. At heart she remained an implacable enemy. Poland was not reconstituted. Saxony, united to the grand-duchy of Warsaw, did not form a state likely to endure, for the state of Silesia cut it in two and the grand-duchy of Warsaw consisted after all of only two million people. The new kingdom of Westphalia was a better conception because it became, in the north of Germany, the companion to Bavaria in the south; but these poor provinces, their population thinly sown, were of little importance. There was no support in all that Napoleon had gained by his conquests. There can be no support in ruins and on the Rhine and the Niemen he had scattered only the ruins of states. That policy was not of Napoleon's best.

Germany was no longer anything but a secondary consideration in Napoleon's gigantic combinations, and the intoxication of success was beginning to lead his strong spirit astray. Austria and Prussia had refused to enter into an alliance and he had crushed them; he now tried to gain the alliance of Russia in offering to Alexander to divide the world with him. He gave him Finland, which was a mistake, because he at once weakened Sweden, then the enemy of France but for centuries her ally

and the guardian of the Baltic against the Muscovites; it le him to the idea of abandoning also the Turkish provinces of th Danube, which was another mistake, for these provinces led t Constantinople, the legitimate ambition of the Russians. An Napoleon had firmly made up his mind he would never let th Russians enter Constantinople, to which therefore he should c no account have opened up the way. In return for these sacri fices he obtained the *Bocche di Cattaro* and the Ionian Islands he also received a promise of rigid application of the continent blockade on the part of Prussia and Russia; finally he secure in advance acceptance of all the changes he proposed to mak in the East.

Summit of Napoleon's Greatness: The Civil Code: The Uni versity.—The years from 1804 till 1807 were the most brilliant period of the empire. Never had such glory been shed upon people by a man. France had a new Charlemagne, greater eve than the old, and the continent bowed in silence before him One thing was wanting to him, the sea, but he had the earth and whilst his sword gained battles, his hand founded enduring institutions.

The Concordat has been mentioned, the effort towards religious peace; the Legion of Honour; the vast system of national recompenses. But Napoleon had done something even greater than all these, he had drawn up the *Civil Code*.

On his return from Marengo, the first consul had charged a commission of four legal authorities, Tronchet, Portalis, Bigot de Preameneu, and Maleville, to consider and arrange the project of a civil code for which preceding assemblies had prepared the material. This great work was accomplished in four months. Bonaparte ordered that the resulting code should be sent to all judicial courts, and a number of useful observations were received from them. The legislative section of the council of state examined these observations, then called in the rough draft which had been communicated to the tribunate and which came back amended and improved, but still not carried into law. They commenced those admirable discussions under the presidency of the first consul and in which he took an honourable and praiseworthy part. He filled every one with his own enthusiasm; he astonished the learned lawyers by the profound knowledge displayed in his views, and especially by that rare good sense which in the making of a good law is of more value than all legal science. And so the charter of family rights and propriety which the legislative body adopted in the session of 1804 was elaborated

hree years later it received the well-deserved name of the *Code of Napoleon*.

Before Napoleon, anarchy reigned in education as in everything else. He wished to introduce order into education, and thought with reason that the state had the right to superintend the education given to the rising generations in order that their education should not be directed against the state. Napoleon created twenty-nine *lycées* where instruction was at once literary, scientific, and moral; 6400 bursaries, representing an annual outlay of five or six millions; assured to these institutions a supply of scholars which the confidence of families did not cease to augment. The private schools, moreover, were required to send their scholars to the courses of these *lycées*. Thus the state resumed the management of secondary education.

For primary education, unfortunately, little was done; schoolmasters were only established in those communes which would or could pay the salary. As for the higher branches for special education, Napoleon founded six schools of law and six of medicine. *L'Ecole polytechnique* existed already; the first consul added the School of Roads and Bridges to produce engineers and that of Fontainebleau to produce officers.

It was in 1802 that Bonaparte organised public instruction on this way. "It is only the beginning," he said; "later on we will do better." And in fact he afterwards founded a great lay body in which the regular and modest life of a student offered, together with a good education, the advantages of religious corporations, and which, not being like the latter separated from the age, educated the scholars in view of the society in which they would afterwards have to live (Decree of March 17, 1804). This body—which was not founded till after repeated attempts, which scholars might not leave except by permission of their equals—was the *University*. Like all great institutions it had its detractors; it was modified but could not be destroyed, because, along with its members, who became public functionaries and fathers of families, it was educating simultaneously the state and society.

Public Works.—At the same time a severe but able administration of public revenues permitted immense works to be undertaken all over France. The canal of the Ourcq gave water to many quarters of Paris which before had none. The canal from Nantes to Brest assured, in spite of English cruisers, the provisioning of the great military port of France: that of the Rhine and Rhône created an important line of interior navigation. At Cherbourg

Napoleon practically threw a mountain into the sea in order to have an immense and safe port on that Channel where French ships found otherwise no point of refuge. At Antwerp he constructed quays, an arsenal, and docks which could hold a large fleet of warships. He furrowed La Vendée with roads which opened up to commerce and to ideas that country till then impenetrable and of which, in a few years, the spirit was transformed. The splendid routes of the Simplon, Mont Cenis, Mont Genevra, Tarare, Metz to Mainz, were achieved. Handsome and useful buildings adorned the great cities: at Paris, the *Madeleine*, the *Arc de l'Etoile*, the largest in the world, the graceful *Arc de Triomphe* of Carrousel, the column of the Place Vendôme which the *communards* of 1871 had the infamy to destroy; at Lyons the Place Bellecour; at Bordeaux the most beautiful bridge in France; at Milan the Arch of Peace, etc. He achieved also the Pantheon or Ste. Geneviève, the palace of the legislative body, the Louvre, which he wished to unite on the north with the Tuileries, as Louis XIV. had united it on the south; he repaired St. Denis, projected the building of the Bourse, constructed slaughter-houses and numerous granaries so that Paris had always a supply of flour in hand for forty-two days; and so on.

Industry and Commerce.—Industry received energetic encouragement; Napoleon promised magnificent rewards to inventors who should endow national industry with secrets drawn from foreign industry. He promised a million to whoever should discover a machine for spinning flax. He promised another million to the scientist who replaced cane sugar by beetroot sugar; he pensioned Jacquard the inventor of that method of weaving silk called by his name; he decorated with his own hand Richard Lenoir for his methods of spinning and weaving cotton; Oberkampf for his painted cloth or oilcloth; he finally created a school of arts and crafts at Compiègne. There were only 310 exhibitors at the exhibition of 1798. In 1806 there were 1422, and the words of the minister who opened the exhibition of 1795 could be more truly repeated of the exhibition of 1806: "It is a campaign against England. Our manufactories are the arsenals whence the arms most fatal to British power must proceed."

The sea-borne commerce was negligible, but the commerce by land was immense. French silks were without rival, their woollen stuffs feared no competition, since the Spanish wool was sent to France instead of to England; French machinery

was being perfected; woollen and linen goods, even cotton goods, found a ready sale on the continent. Napoleon promulgated in 1808 the commercial code. He attached so much importance to it that the day after his return from Tilsit, July 28, 1807, he went to take part in the discussion on the *Titles of Bankruptcy*.

Art and Letters.—The glory of letters was not wanting to this great reign, but the principal writers were in the opposition; Chateaubriant, Madame de Staël, Cabanis, Maine de Biran, Chenier, Ducis, Bernardin de St. Pierre, Le Maistre, De Bonald, Destutt de Tracy, Deslisle, and even Fontanes, the official orator of the empire, but these last with the prudent reserve of public silence.

Art followed a brilliant career. David had given it a violent shock in order to awaken it from the enervating insipidity of the eighteenth century. He had brought the French school back to the fruitful study of the antique. If his pupils, in exaggerating the faults of the master, painted like sculptors and gave to their draperies the stiffness of military dress, some of them, and chiefly Gros, began to agitate against that cold and academic style of painting in joining the worship of nature to that of rules and regulations. *Les Pestiférés de Jaffa* appeared at the exhibition of 1806. Guérin, Gérard, Girodet, and Proudhon were, after David and Gros, the most celebrated painters of that time; Greuze had died in 1805. The sciences with Laplace, Lagrange, Monge, Hauy, Fourcroy, Berthollet, Georges Cuvier, Bichat, Cabanis, Geoffroy St. Hilaire, Gay-Lussac, Al. Brongniart, Thénard, etc., took that marvellous flight which led them to accomplish so many amazing results. This period was to them what the time of Louis XIV. was to their forefathers, but Napoleon, who kept even while on the throne his title as a member of the institute, treated the scholars better than that great king had treated the poets. He was the personal friend of many of them. Learning one day that Berthollet was embarrassed in his affairs, "I have always," he said, "a hundred million francs at the service of my friends."

CHAPTER LXV

THE EMPIRE FROM 1807 TO 1812

Feudal Kingdoms.—It has been seen how the emperor created defences and supports in surrounding the empire by feudal kingdoms. The kingdom of Naples under his brother Joseph, and that of Italy under Eugène Beauharnais as viceroy, protected France on the south-east; the Swiss confederation, of which Napoleon was mediator, the Confederation of the Rhine, of which he was protector, guarded her on the east; the kingdom of Holland, in the hands of Louis Bonaparte, defended the approaches from the north-east. On that side Napoleon had just created for his fourth brother, Jerome, the kingdom of Westphalia. Time had not given these new kingdoms the force which comes to human institutions evolved in the natural course of centuries, nor sealed the alliance of these newly-made kings with their peoples; time cannot be hurried; these young dynasties had yet to push their roots into the soil which supported them—if they could. All the eastern frontiers of the empire were thus protected; on the south, Napoleon had nothing on which he could count. A degenerate branch of the house of Bourbon was on the throne at Madrid, but he was under the direction of a court favourite, Godoï, Prince de la Paix. Before Jena, Spain had armed against France; the Prussian monarchy broken, Spain declared her preparations had been made in support of France. Napoleon did not deceive himself as to her real intentions; he returned from Tilsit, hoping to connect the Iberian peninsula in one way or another with his policy.

Conquest of Portugal (November, 1807): Naval Armaments.—Napoleon resolved first to drive the English from Portugal, and offered to divide the kingdom with Spain. An army commanded by Junot crossed Spain and entered Lisbon without one blow having been struck. At the same time the Russians conquered Finland, and England excited the indignation of Europe by a new violation of the rights of peoples—the attack against Copenhagen, which she bombarded for three days in order to possess herself of the Danish fleet. She also robbed the arsenal which was reputed to be richly supplied. This outrage caused Denmark and Austria to join the continental blockade to which Portugal already belonged. From the extreme north of the Baltic

to the straits of Gibraltar, all continental ports were closed against the English. Simultaneously, immense armaments were being prepared at Texel, Brest, Lorient, Rochefort, Cadiz, and Toulon: the flotilla of Boulogne was reorganised and a new menace was held over England. This time the whole continent sided with France. England could not hold out long. She was saved by a mistake of Napoleon's—his intervention in Spain, which took place at the same time as his rupture with the pope.

Rupture with the Pope (April 2, 1808).—The contention with the pope arose over the question of the continental blockade. The pope intended to remain neutral, but as a temporal power he could not escape the measures imposed on all continental states. But he wished to; more than that, he refused to recognise Joseph Bonaparte as King of Naples, and he constantly opposed Napoleon's policy in France and Italy. Napoleon did not pay much attention to this resistance; tired by a war of "Notes," threatened by excommunication, he occupied Rome on April 2, 1808. But this capital, so easy to take, was impossible to hold save with great difficulty; this old man who had neither soldier nor gun seemed harder to vanquish than the innumerable troops of Austria. The sword of the conqueror was bound to break against this unassailable power, who commanded not armies but consciences. Napoleon declared in vain—after Wagram—the temporal domination of the suppressed pope; he had constituted Rome and its territories into two French departments, and he had retained the pontiff in an honourable captivity at Savona. He found himself weakened by these measures, for a powerful opposition was formed against him from the ranks of the clergy and the French Catholics. The great services he had rendered the Church were forgotten: the altars he had set up; the worship he had restored; France led by him to Catholic unity—in spite of all this the author of the *Concordat* was regarded only as the persecutor of the sovereign pontiff. In signing the *Concordat*, the first consul had said, "The clergy is a force: I will seize it." He did not know that that force never allows itself to be seized; it had now turned against him.

The Invasion of Spain (1808).—The intervention of the emperor in Spain had serious consequences. The court at Madrid was deeply divided in itself. Godoï dominated the king and queen, but was abhorrent to the Prince of the Asturias and to the whole nation. He had hoped to raise himself from this contempt in which the nation held him by an attack in conjunction with an Anglo-Portuguese army on the south of France. That was before

Jena; after Jena he humbly solicited the favour of Napoleon. An illness of King Charles IV. decided the queen and Godoï to seek means to deprive the heir-presumptive of the throne; the heir defended himself against this intrigue in imploring—as so many had done—the help of Napoleon. But in addition to these entreaties to the powerful master of the west, he arranged a plot to compass the downfall of Godoï. His papers were seized; he was arrested and criminal proceedings were begun against him. Such was the family who ruled over Spain, who allowed that beautiful country to fall into the most shameful torpor.

Napoleon, feeling at once that he could have no dealings with such princes, wished to drive them to take refuge in America, as the house of Braganza had taken refuge in Brazil. He thought to overpower them by mobilising great forces behind the Pyrenees. But a fresh scandal caused this plan to miscarry. A rising which broke out at Aranjuez forced Charles IV. to abdicate in favour of his son Ferdinand VII. Godoï ran the risk of his life and was wounded. But Murat with his army was already close to Madrid; he entered, refused to recognise the revolution of Aranjuez, and persuaded the old king to go to Napoleon near Bayonne. Ferdinand took the same road, to plead his cause with the redoubtable arbitrator. They were blind to the fact that whoever went into this trap would never come out. Intimidated or deceived, they abdicated under the advice of the emperor. Charles IV. went to live at Compiègne in an imperial castle; Ferdinand VII. at Valencay in partial captivity. Joseph gave up the crown of Naples, which had suited him well, to Murat and took that of Spain, a much heavier responsibility which he was not capable of supporting. A *Junta* (Spanish council) of the principal personages of Spain convoked at Bayonne recognised the king and promulgated at the same time a new constitution for the monarchy.

All through this affair Napoleon had played a part which did not agree with his character, his force, or his glory. He wished it to sink into oblivion under the great services he hoped to render Spain during his rule. But a proud people repulse even benefits when they are conferred by a strange hand, the hand of an enemy. While official Spain hastened to do homage to the new king, the people rebelled. Insurrection broke out in every quarter with patriotic fury. Religious united with political passions fanned the conflagration to a white heat. The monks preached the war like a crusade.

The movement soon became formidable; all the provinces

joined in; French soldiers who were ill or wounded—as well as their couriers—were put to death. Bessières had gained a victory at Rio-Seco on July 14, which opened the gates of Madrid to Joseph. At Saragossa and Valencia the French troops were repulsed. One of the most brilliant generals of the great army, Dupont, surrounded at Baylen in Andalusia, signed a capitulation which was unworthily violated (July 20). On the return journey to France, 18,000 French soldiers were wrecked on the barren rock of Cabrera, one of the Balearic Isles, where they were left to perish of hunger and misery.

It was the first reverse which Napoleon had sustained. His grief was so bitter that the joy of the enemy knew no bounds. Soon afterwards the English arrived and General Wellesley gained the Battle of Vimeiro against Junot, a battle which lost Portugal to France (Capitulation of Cintra, August 30). By September, 1808, the French possessed, in the whole peninsula, only the provinces to the north of the Ebro.

The emperor proposed to make good the reverses of his lieutenants. But the chief army was in Germany, where Austria dissimulated her hatred and her armaments in a way that deceived no one, least of all Napoleon. In order to brave Austria it was necessary to be sure of Russia. Napoleon had an interview with the Emperor Alexander at Erfurt, which appeared to consolidate the alliance entered into at Tilsit. Napoleon had already ceded Finland; he now added Moldavia and Wallachia, and Russia recognised Joseph as King of Spain (October 12, 1808). The mistakes of France in the west served to enlarge Russia's domains in the east.

Napoleon was now free to hasten to Spain. He had already mobilised 100,000 men; he raised another great army of 150,000 dauntless soldiers, and arrived with them beyond the mountains. Nothing could stand before him; the centre of the enemy was broken at Burgos (November 10), at Espinosa (November 12), at Tudela (November 23); further forward the famous light cavalry of Poland took the pass of Somo Sierra at the gallop (November 13), and the army entered Madrid where Napoleon decreed the abolition of the Inquisition, of two-thirds of the convents, of feudal rights, and of internal customs houses (December 4). On the left wing, St. Cyr made a fine campaign on his own account. Having taken Rosas, he crossed Catalonia without a single gun to raise the blockade of Barcelona. He defeated the enemy twice, at Cardeleu and Molins del Rey. On the right wing, Soult drove 30,000 English as far as Corunna,

and forced them to take refuge on their ships. A storm which surprised the French troops on the ridge of the Guadarrama retarded their march by forty-eight hours, and thus saved the English army.

Battles of Abensberg and Eckmühl (April 21 and 22, 1809).—But already Napoleon was called elsewhere, and the danger of this new enterprise seemed extreme. Austria, seeing him deeply engaged in the Iberian Peninsula, set herself to wage a terrible war in the south-west of his empire and thought the moment had now come to avenge her long disasters at his hands. England offered Austria 100 millions to help with this war and the enthusiasm of Alexander of Russia for Napoleon seemed at once to grow cold. Germany, burdened by her war indemnities to France and tormented by secret societies, showed herself hostile; finally Napoleon's great army, weakened by the loss of 150,000 men, was scattered over the country from Hamburg to Naples. A bold offensive gave promise of success, but success promised a general rising. "Shake off the yoke," said the Archduke John to the Italians, "to the end that Italy may take again that rank among the great powers which she formerly held and which she will certainly hold again." The Archduke Charles with 175,000 men marched towards Bavaria. They could have entered it at any time since March; the Inn was not crossed till the 10th of April; six days were spent in travelling twenty leagues. That was the first mistake. Napoleon, informed of this in forty-hours by telegram, left Paris on the 13th April and arrived at the scene of operations on the 17th. It was high time, for his army, surprised, had not yet achieved the concentration of its forces. Masséna was at Augsburg with 60,000 men and Davout, 25 leagues from there, at Ratisbon with 50,000 men. But already the archduke was manœuvring to throw himself on the large vacant space between the two marshals in order to overwhelm one of them. Napoleon immediately discovered the remedy for this perilous situation; he established himself with 40,000 men on the Abensberg, an excellent defensive position between Ratisbon and Augsburg; there he called his two lieutenants to him.

Davout had great difficulty in forcing a passage through the masses of Austrian troops which already commenced to surround him. But the brilliant action of Tengen made it possible for him to execute his movement. Then the position of the two armies was the exact opposite of that which it had been a few days earlier. The French had concentrated their forces and the

Austrians, on account of the offensive movement of the archduke against Davout, were extended on a line of thirty leagues from Munich to Ratisbon. Napoleon seized this opportunity. He threw himself on the enemy's centre, cut his forces in two by the Battle of Abensberg on April 20th and by the capture of Landshut on the 21st, descended the following day on their right flank, crushed them at Eckmühl, drove them to their last extremity on the Danube, and would have taken them had Ratisbon not fallen a few days earlier. But great results had been attained. By five days' fighting Napoleon had taken 60,000 men, 100 guns, immense quantities of stores and ammunition, cut the Austrian army in two, thrown the right wing back on Bohemia, the left wing on the Inn, and conquered the route to Vienna. On the 10th of May, one month after the commencement of hostilities, he was before that capital, which, after a bombardment of some hours, opened its gates to him.

Essling (21st and 22nd May, 1809).—There were two armies in Austria: that of Italy under the Archduke John, who, after having beaten Eugène at Sacile and threatened the line of the Adige, had, on the news of Napoleon's success, retreated with all haste on the Piave and then into Hungary. The other army in Austria was that of the Archduke Charles, who was still at the head of 100,000 men in front of Vienna, but on the other side of the Danube. Napoleon turned against him. The crossing of a great river in face of a powerful army is a difficult operation. Napoleon attempted it and was at first successful. Thirty thousand men had emerged from the island of Lobau on the left bank before the villages of Essling and Aspern when a sudden spate on the river, which rose seven feet, carried away the bridges. They were rebuilt; 30,000 more soldiers crossed; but the river was steadily rising. The bridges were carried away a second time before the forces engaged had got all their artillery and munitions across. For thirty hours the archduke made vain efforts to push the French into the River Danube; the gardens, the houses, the fences of Aspern were taken and retaken fourteen times. The archduke was the first to abandon this interminable struggle and the French soldiers returned when and how they would to the island of Lobau, Masséna being the last to leave the river.

On the two wings no action had been taken, there were neither victors nor vanquished. But more than 40,000 men, of whom 27,000 were Austrians, had been killed or wounded. More than the population of a large town had been sacrificed in a few hours

and without result. The battles of Eylau and Friedland had begun those terrible massacres which increased from then up till the last days of the empire, for the opposing armies operated every year with larger forces, and in defeating the enemy the French taught them how to resist.

Napoleon had been wounded at Ratisbon by a spent ball in the instep.[1] At Essling two of his bravest lieutenants, General St. Hilaire and Marshal Lannes, had been killed.

Wagram (July 6, 1809).—On his return to the island of Lobau, Napoleon caused formidable works to be executed to convert it into a fortress from which he could emerge at pleasure on either bank of the river. He feared that the Archduke John, repulsed in Italy and defeated by Eugène under the walls of Raab, would not rejoin the Archduke Charles; that he in his turn might be tempted to cross the Danube in order to drive away the French and relieve Vienna. The whole Tyrol was in insurrection; on the Elbe the partisans of Prussia overflowed the country; the population of Swabia was agitated; the sons of the Duke of Brunswick had mobilised nearly 8000 men in Franconia and Saxony; the German people, trodden under foot, began to reassert themselves, the whole country was shaken by internal agitation and unrest.

It only needed a reverse to cause the explosion which was preparing to break out. But Napoleon had summoned his Italian army to him; he was in a state of mind to dread nothing. On the 5th of July he emerged from the island of Lobau with 150,000 men and 550 guns before the enemy, who was in equal force, could offer any resistance to this magnificent operation, an operation unique in the records of military history and which the river on this occasion did not molest. At break of day the French army was found established on the left of the enemy, having thus turned and rendered useless the immense works he had constructed at Aspern, Essling, and Enzersdorf to prevent the passage of the French. The Austrians retired on the heights of Wagram. On the following day the archduke tried to turn the left of the French army, which was extended over three leagues, in order to cut it off from the Danube. But Masséna was on this side, and the archduke could not expect to pass him and his

[1] It has often been said that this was the only wound he received. At St. Helena he told Las Cases how, before Toulon, a bayonet thrust had cut his thigh and left a deep scar; that at Essling or at Wagram a bullet had torn his boot, his stocking, and the skin of his leg; that many times his horse had been killed under him, but that these accidents were always carefully kept from the public.

troops without some difficulty. While the intrepid marshal, bruised by a recent fall and travelling in a light carriage, stopped the enemy columns on the left, the emperor commanded Drouot to take 100 guns at the gallop to the front of the line to pierce the enemy's centre with bullets. Macdonald then threw himself on the enemy forces and forced them to retreat. At the same time Davout and Oudinot on the right carried the heights of Wagram. The Archduke Charles sounded the retreat. He had lost 24,000 men killed or wounded, 12,000 prisoners, and 20 guns. The French had 7000 killed and 11,000 wounded. It was not one of Napoleon's most famous battles like those of Ulm, Austerlitz, and Jena, but Napoleon had no longer the same quality of troops. Many young soldiers, many foreigners filled the gaps caused in the great army by the divisions sent to Spain; and with these inexperienced troops the bold strokes of war were undertaken at much greater risk. If Napoleon had had the soldiers of Austerlitz at Wagram, a manœuvre which he did not dare to attempt would certainly have spelt a great disaster for the Austrian army. But the Austrian army fled, vanquished, incapable of rallying or resisting. An armistice was signed at Znaïm on July 11; the Treaty of Vienna was not completed till October 14. Austria lost 3,400,000 of her population, which was divided between Napoleon, Bavaria, Saxony, the grand-duchy of Warsaw, and Russia. The greatest number went naturally to the French empire which extended the Illyrian provinces as far as the right bank of the Save—an extension that was of no use to France.

Events in Spain: Flushing (1809).—During the Austrian campaign, war had continued in Spain, spreading over all the provinces like an insurrection; there were therefore an innumerable number of small engagements and not a single battle. There were 300,000 French soldiers in Spain. But Napoleon was not there. And the difference of opinion among his marshals prevented any concerted action. Each was jealous of the other; each drew to himself provisions, money, and troops; more than one consoled himself for the defeat of a colleague in remembering that it was also a check to a rival. Unity of plan was constantly sacrificed to the individual interests of generals, the campaign was arranged in order that each might command the best part of his own forces, rather than in consideration of the great exchequer of war which Napoleon directed from such a distance. The best-known action was the memorable siege of Saragossa. That town was only taken after an attack of eight months'

duration, twenty-eight days of open warfare, and twenty-three days of fighting in the streets, the convents, and the churches (February 21, 1809). But little profit resulted from this success. An expedition made by Soult into Portugal was a complete failure, although the marshal did enter Oporto. Ney evacuated Galicia and the Battle of Talavera, fought by Joseph Bonaparte and Wellesley on July 26, 1809, was almost a defeat, had the approach of Soult with his army corps not forced the Anglo-Spanish forces to retreat into Andalusia. In spite of the retreat, the campaign was already lost.

The English had also threatened the naval power of France. At the island of Aix they had launched thirty fire-ships against a French squadron; at the mouths of the Scheldt they had taken possession of Flushing (August 15, 1809) and threatened the great arsenal of Antwerp, where Napoleon declared he aimed a pistol at the heart of England. The national guards of the neighbouring departments threw themselves on the town; fever decimated the 45,000 men whom the English fleet had disembarked on the island of Walcheren. They were forced to abandon Flushing; nothing remained to the greatest naval power in the world save the ridicule of an immense effort realising only infinitesimal results.

Effect produced on the Spirit of the Country by Recent Events.—Up till the Peace of Tilsit Napoleon had mounted ever higher in glory and power. In presence of this man in whom genius and fortune seemed to transcend human limits there had been place neither for criticism nor fear. But in 1807 admiration without abating, confidence without lessening, demanded that the flight of the imperial eagles should be brought to an end in order that France might enjoy her marvellous greatness in undisturbed peace. The spoliation of the Bourbons of Spain, the captivity of the Holy Father, had awakened the first inquietude; the war in Spain and in Austria added to it in spite of the trophies of Burgos and Abensberg. The cause of this was that behind these regular armies and these ancient governments with which France had alone made war since 1792, the peoples were now for the first time seen to rise against France. In Spain the insurrection, formerly the ally of France, was now paralysing immense forces; in Germany insurrection had broken out in twenty different districts; and at Schoenbrunn in the midst of his army Napoleon had just escaped death at the hands of an assassin belonging to the *Tugend-Bund* (a secret society whose objects were to arouse German patriotism; for this end it attempted to

produce general risings). The Battle of Essling gave an alarm which remained in many minds even after the Battle of Wagram and the Treaty of Vienna.

These symptoms could not have escaped the far-seeing eye of Napoleon. But accustomed to success he no longer took obstacles into account and did not believe anything could stand in his way. On his return from Wagram he seemed to one of his friends to be preoccupied, a state of mind previously unknown to his great personality. "He had always the air," said Cambacères in his *Mémoires*, "of living in the midst of his glory." In order to reassure public opinion, which was nervous and alarmed, Napoleon wished to dominate its attention, as he knew so well how to do, by some unexpected move. He announced his approaching marriage with a grand-duchess.

Marriage of Napoleon to Marie Louise (April 1, 1810).—Napoleon's union with Josephine had produced no child. In spite of his affection for Eugène Beauharnais, the son of his wife, and whom he had adopted, the emperor yet wished fervently for an heir of his own blood. He resolved on that account to contract a new union. Acting on the long-established custom of absolute monarchs, who only married among their equals, this glorious *parvenu* of the Revolution, this chief elected by a great people, demanded to enter a family of kings. Russia had been an unfaithful ally to him in the last war; he thought he could win Austria to his side by marriage and demanded of the haughty race of the Habsburgs the hand of one of its daughters, Marie Louise (April 1, 1810). It was an unfortunate and unhappy marriage, for the new empress was never popular in France, while in her own country she was regarded as a victim sacrificed for the redemption of the house of Austria. To many, Napoleon's divorce from Josephine Beauharnais, the gracious and devoted companion of his early years, seemed also the divorce from his happiness and good fortune.

Birth of the King of Rome (March 20, 1811).—The clouds which had passed across the horizon of the empire were dispersed by the brilliance of the marriage festivities, gloomy forebodings were forgotten. The year 1810 passed with no other war save that with Spain, and France was now accustomed to the leisurely course of that campaign. On March 20, 1811, a son was born to Napoleon. He was proclaimed from his cradle the King of Rome. Thoughts again dwelt on the eternity of the empire; the powers which since 1792 had struggled against the Revolution were now resigned to suffer it, or affected not to recognise it in

its most illustrious representative, especially now that a descendant of the Habsburgs was to inherit it. It was said that Napoleon, arrived at a mature age and having to guard the heritage of his son, applied himself now to smoothing the road for his heir, and governed now as a father instead of by strokes of genius.

But there were those who, even in the midst of this grandeur, saw the causes of ruin ferment and grow. One of those who was to be the chief cause of that ruin, Wellington, predicted it to the English ministers, who were tired of the struggle and frightened by their isolation. After Wagram and after the Austrian marriage, Wellington reassured them and urged them to continue the combat in showing them the increasingly unstable foundations of the Colossus.

The year 1811 had not drawn to its close before Napoleon commenced his preparations for the most foolhardy of all his enterprises, his expedition into Russia.

CHAPTER LXVI

THE EMPIRE FROM 1812 TO 1814

State of Europe in 1810.—No single generation of mankind ever saw such changes as were seen by those who lived from 1789 to 1811. New ideas filled the world; unheard-of sorrows and glories were experienced; a people became an army; armies more mighty than the legions of Rome were formed; war resulted in remarkable combinations and in the attainment of unexampled results; and finally, to apply these new ideas and to control this new vigour, to direct these formidable powers, there was a man endowed with one of the mightiest minds that the world has ever known. In twenty years the old Europe had been uprooted from its foundations. The Bourbon dynasty, formerly occupying four thrones, retained but the throne of Sicily, and that threatened and trembling. The house of Braganza was exiled in Brazil; the house of Savoy was relegated to Sardinia; the houses of Orange, Hesse, and Brunswick, and twenty other reigning families were despoiled of their lands. The duchies of Parma, Modena, and Tuscany, the republics of Venice, Genoa, and Holland, the states of the Church and the Holy Roman Empire had ceased to exist. The monarchy of the great Frederic was shattered and existed but as a feeble flicker;

the monarchy of Maria Theresa, humbled by twenty defeats, was cut off from Italy and from the sea.

If some thrones had been overturned others had been erected. There were now Kings of Italy, Holland, Westphalia, Würtemburg, and Saxony; there was a Confederation of the Rhine to hold the balance between the remnants of Prussia and Austria; a Swiss confederation, established on surer bases than the old confederation; a grand-duchy of Warsaw, a partial reparation for the political crime of 1773.

In these new states social had accompanied political regeneration. Naples, Milan, and Warsaw, Holland, Westphalia, and Bavaria had French constitutions, the French code, and the French system of administration. Sweden asked France for a king; Marshal Bernadotte was adopted by Charles XIII., who had no child, and was proclaimed Prince Royal by the states (August 21, 1810). In the wake of the French armies new ideas spread everywhere. Spain, which would not receive a king from France, adopted as her own the principles of 1789 and embodied them in her constitution of 1812. Austria and Prussia sought weapons with which to combat France and found them where France had found her arms, in right and liberty. In Austria local liberties were granted to the peoples of the empire; in Prussia territorial serfdom was abolished, civil equality was established, and a title of nobility was no longer required in order to secure the rank of officer. Even England experienced the moral contagion. In Sicily she compelled King Ferdinand to renounce his absolute power; at home she began to repair the long series of injustices done to Ireland and to enter on that path of progressive reform which prevented her in the future from feeling the commotions of the continent.

Thus the French Revolution, the new order founded on justice and not on privilege, began to spread through the world. But such changes could not occur without causing terrible upheavals. It is the law of humanity that there is no birth save through suffering. The dynasties overthrown, the aristocracies despoiled, those powers trampled under foot by the triumphant Revolution did not resign themselves to their defeat. As long as France seemed only to conquer to give to the conquered lands juster laws and a better administration the peoples were with her; on the Rhine and on the Adige loud acclamations had saluted the tricolour. But when England, invulnerable in her island, offered to the implacable hatred of kings and nobles means of satisfaction, the struggle between the two principles, the old

and the new organisation, assumed such proportions that all, even liberty and justice, was sacrified to the desire for victory. The English first suppressed the freedom of the seas ; Napoleon, in his turn, destroyed the independence of the continent, and by the continental blockade, the interruption of commerce, the stoppage of the arrival of colonial goods which were necessary to Europe, he imposed on the nations sacrifices which were profoundly resented. His political system destroyed their liberty ; his economic system changed their habits ; it was too great a change for one period. In vain he heaped benefits upon them, freeing Germany from a crowd of needy princelings who maintained perpetual anarchy in that land, and Italy from the municipal jealousy which left her defenceless against the foreigner. In vain did he attempt to rouse Spain from her age-long sloth. Peoples ceded, reannexed, divided like cattle, felt wounded in their legitimate pride and injured in their most vital interests. Existing evils bred distrust in the good which was to come some day and in the germs of prosperity and greatness which the conqueror sowed wherever victory led him. The Spaniards greeted his salutary reforms with musket shots. The Italian Liberals were soon ready to hold out a hand to Austria, their ancient and mortal enemy, and Germany had already tried a dagger thrust at the conqueror whose life was attempted by Staaps at Schoenbrunn.

If the peoples were alienated, the kings were not conciliated. In the eyes of the old courts Napoleon was always a *parvenu*, his empire a plebeian institution. The kings flattered him and besieged him with their protestations of devotion, but at the first reverse he was able to gauge their sincerity. While France included Rome and Hamburg among the capitals of her prefectures, she was still isolated among the nations ; Napoleon might be the protector of kings and the son-in-law of the successor of Charles V., but he was isolated among sovereigns. Having conquered so often, he desired to conquer yet again ; having entered Madrid and Naples, Vienna and Berlin, he desired to enter Moscow also as a victor. Moscow was the route to London, the only capital which had never yet beheld the victorious eagles, the only capital at which the eagles might stay their glorious flight, give peace to the world, and assure to France a grandeur beyond compare.

State of France.—France had by this time had her fill of military glory and of conquests ; peace was for her, as for others, the great desideratum. Victorious though she had been, she had

yet suffered cruelly in this ceaseless war which took so many arms from industry and agriculture, which developed military at the expense of pacific instincts, and which tended to introduce the practices of the camp into civil society. Order was everywhere restored; riots, plots, violent discussions in the tribune or the press, all had ceased; the legislative body and the senate were thoroughly devoted, never contradicted; and the journals, strictly censored, had lost all political significance. Yet, in the midst of the profound calm which reigned, there was a tendency to ask that the government, powerful as it was, should have less fear of such writers as Madame de Staël, whom it exiled, and Chateaubriant, whom it excluded from the Academy; that it should, on the other hand, pay attention to the rising tide of public opinion that it might learn what were the legitimate desires of the people.

Ten years before, France had forgotten, or rather had not yet learned, that political liberty is the necessary safeguard of civil liberties; that civil liberty, timid and fearful, is helpless and may be easily crushed if political liberty is not existent ready to watch over and defend her. But such reflections now began to permeate men's minds. In order to save material interests, imperilled by a government which was too weak, France had applauded the *coup d'état* of the Brumaire; it was to save those same interests, to revive commerce which was ruined and industry which was declining, to end the mourning of families decimated by the war, the fears of citizens who felt that they were no longer under the absolute protection of the law, that a feeble opposition, though one destined to grow in strength, was formed against a government which had become too strong, and it may be said too absolute. Already in Paris itself, despite careful management, the crowd showed less enthusiasm; during the scarcity of 1811 it had murmured sufficiently to lead Napoleon to avoid appearing in public in order that he might not hear them.

With the return of peace, when the cannon were silenced and the smoke of the battlefield had rolled away, Napoleon would doubtless have appreciated the new needs of the situation. With peace, profitable public works would have been undertaken which would have changed the face of the land. If in the midst of so many wars the emperor had been able successfully to accomplish so many vast enterprises, and if in the midst of such vast expenditure he had been able each year to set aside for works of public utility more than had hitherto ever been set

aside in the course of a whole reign—what would he not have been able to effect when free to reduce his war budget for the sake of public works, agriculture, commerce, industry, and arts? Great men who have worn crowns have always loved war. What a magnificent spectacle Napoleon and his empire would have afforded, the genius of battle personified become a pacific hero, France strong, glorious, and free.

Rupture between Russia and France (1812).—At Tilsit Napoleon thought he had found in Russia the ally of whom he had need on the continent, but Alexander, in the war of 1809, had not given him his promised help, and when Napoleon demanded from him the hand of one of his sisters, he showed so little enthusiasm that the emperor turned again to Austria and married Marie Louise. The czar displayed deep annoyance at a union which he might have prevented; he was further offended by the extension of the grand-duchy of Warsaw effected at the Treaty of Vienna, and he attempted to obtain from France a declaration that the kingdom of Poland, the greater part of which he held, should never be restored. Napoleon would not consent "to stain his memory by putting the seal on a machiavellian act." The friendship of the two rulers was already strained; the extension of the French empire and the measures taken to secure the better enforcement of the continental blockade struck the final blows at the union of France and Russia.

In reply to the Berlin decrees, England had threatened the confiscation of all ships which entered the ports of France or her allies (January 7, 1807). Napoleon in his turn declared every ship denationalised which touched at a port of England or of her colonies (Milan Decree, December 17, 1807), and ordered the burning of all English merchandise found in France or in allied states. These decrees destroyed regular commerce, but could not destroy smuggling, which was carried on on a large scale, especially from the ports between Antwerp and Hamburg. The Dutch, who had once ruled the seas, and who saw themselves ruined by these prohibitions, constantly evaded them; Holland became an English market. The King of Holland, Louis Bonaparte, shut his eyes, despite the frequent and stringent orders of his brother. His position became intolerable; he was forced to choose between his subjects who wanted one thing and the emperor who wanted another. On July 3, 1810, he abdicated rather than remain, with the title of king, a mere prefect of Napoleon at Amsterdam. Holland was at once annexed to the empire (July 9). The Scheldt, Meuse, Rhine, and

Ems were thus closed against English smuggling, but the Weser and the Elbe remained open. A decree presently announced the annexation of the Hanseatic towns of Hamburg, Bremen, and Lübeck (December 13, 1810). Thus France, which already extended along the whole coast of the North Sea, touched the Baltic and presented the strange spectacle of an empire which brought under the same laws the Tiber and the Elbe. But, for the sake of the continental system, it was needful to go further, to close the ports of Dantzic, Koenigsberg, and Petersburg, as the ports from Lübeck to Cadiz, from Cadiz to Venice, from Venice to Corfu had been closed. Dantzic already had a French garrison which was quietly increased day by day.

The duchy of Oldenburg, lying between the Ems and the Weser, was on the line of these new acquisitions and Napoleon had seized it (December 13). The czar, who was the nephew of the dispossessed prince, complained without avail at this offensive conduct; so far from satisfying his ally's legitimate complaints, Napoleon showed himself still more exacting in the matter of the continental blockade. The Russians demanded that American ships should at least be permitted to bring colonial products to them; the emperor demanded that Alexander should confiscate all neutral ships entering his ports, as suspected of having contravened the decrees of Berlin and Milan. This was to demand the final ruin of Russian commerce at the very moment when, by his system of licences, Napoleon himself was authorising a certain amount of commerce between France and England. It was, moreover, to place Russia in a position of quasi-dependence, since her internal government was compelled to submit to orders issued from Paris. Such dependence was desired by Napoleon. In a dispatch of March, 1812, to Count Lauriston, the French ambassador at Petersburg, the Duke of Bassano said, "It is essential that there should be a real return to the system which was established at Tilsit and that Russia should resume the inferior position which she then occupied."

At the same time the French empire had become from a territorial point of view dangerous to Russia, since it almost bordered on that country to the north in the Baltic, threatened it in the centre by means of the grand-duchy of Warsaw, and menaced it to the south by means of the Illyrian provinces, where France was in touch with the sultan. Yet the czar, fearful of the new struggle, hesitated for a time; Bernadotte decided him for war, and on April 8, 1812, Alexander demanded the evacuation of old Prussia, the duchy of Warsaw, and Swedish

Pomerania, an indemnity for Oldenburg, and certain modifications in the measures taken against neutral commerce.

It was, however, to Napoleon's interest not to precipitate events. England was not yet exhausted, but she appeared to be on the verge of collapse. The labouring classes were unemployed; the poor lacked bread; commerce was paralysed. The Thames was filled with ships laden with goods; sugar which cost six francs at Paris cost six shillings in London; the paper money was at a discount of 18 per cent. A rupture between England and America was imminent. It was the right policy for France to be patient, to be calm, and to lull the fears of Europe; then victory would be hers, since she was the better able to bear longest these terrible conditions. Further, the war in Spain was not ended. Masséna, Soult, Ney, the ablest French generals, were checked by a patient leader, Wellington, who left nothing to chance and by a general rising of the people, which might be punished but which could not be stifled. Napoleon should not have launched forth into any new adventure until this bleeding wound in the side of his empire had been healed. By an act of rashness, which at an earlier date he would not have committed, he left this undecided struggle behind him to absorb his best troops, and went to join the grand army. "After this war," he said, "the European system will be founded, the cause of the age won, the Revolution finished." Russia was, in actual fact, the last refuge on the continent of all the ideas which the Revolution had fought for twenty years. But vast schemes filled the mind of Napoleon; Moscow was to be a stepping-stone for the resumption on a colossal scale of his designs against India, which had been thwarted at Aboukir. A secret agent traversed the whole district between the Red Sea and the Indus and united all the Arab chiefs in a common enterprise against British India. Persia was sounded and gained; the defeated czar was to supply auxiliaries; a Franco-Russian army, setting out from Tiflis and gathering in its passage all the nomads of those lands, was to hurl itself into the valley of the Ganges.

Passing through Dresden, Napoleon found there the Emperor of Austria, the Kings of Prussia, Bavaria, and Saxony, and a crowd of princes, who had come to assure him of their devotion. "I promised you that I would show you an audience of kings and I have kept my word," said the emperor to Talma, the celebrated tragedian.

For her war against Russia, France counted on Sweden and Turkey, but Napoleon had offended the former by abandoning

Finland to Russia and the latter by his readiness to abandon Wallachia and Moldavia to Russia. Bernadotte forgot that he was a Frenchman: he permitted himself to be bribed by the offer of Norway, made to him by England, and mediated the Peace of Bucharest between the Porte and the czar (May 28, 1812). These were two blunders for which Sweden and Turkey will pay dearly one day, in default of some powerful foreign aid; they both lost an opportunity of warding from their doors a state which holds them in restraint. Had Bernadotte hurled himself upon Finland and threatened Petersburg, Napoleon would have been able to make peace at Moscow, and the son of Bernadotte would not have beheld the smoke of Russian guns from the windows of the palace of Stockholm. Russia, reassured on her left and right flanks, was able to concentrate all her forces in the centre, which Napoleon attacked. The French army, with the numerous auxiliaries that constituted a third of its total strength, amounted to 640,000 men, with over 60,000 horses and 1200 cannon. The Russians were less numerous, but they fought in their own land and for a national cause.

Russian Campaign (1812).—The Russian minister of war, who commanded the main army in person, was Barclay de Tolly. His plan was to cover the road to Petersburg with a force of 130,000 men resting on the Dwina, while Prince Bagration, based on the Dnieper, should cover the route to Moscow. Between the sources of these two rivers lie gentle undulations which divide the basin of the Baltic from that of the Black Sea. It was through this gap, eighty kilometres in extent between Witepsk and Smolensk, that Napoleon proposed to pass. He crossed the Niemen at Kowno (June 24), pressing back the Russians before him, no difficult task in the initial operations of an army which assumed the offensive, and entered Vilna, where the Lithuanians received him with transports of joy (June 28). He was besought to restore the old kingdom of Poland, but, genius of order and government as he was, he did not appreciate popular forces and demanded regiments where he was offered an insurrection. He feared also to rouse discontent in Austria, who held part of Poland and would have been unable to retain her possessions if the Polish kingdom had risen from the tomb.

Napoleon halted at Vilna for seventeen days, instead of crushing the Russians, who had been thrown into confusion by the ability of his first steps. But he designed to make this city the centre of his supplies and already at the first stage of the

campaign, he feared the difficulty and danger of operating a such a distance from his real frontiers.

After this disastrous halt, he moved towards Moscow in orde to divide the two chief Russian armies, defeated the rear-guar of Barclay at Ostrowno (July 25) and occupied Witepsk (Jul 28). But Bagration, defeated by Davout at Mohilev, beyon the Dnieper (July 23), formed a junction with Barclay nea Smolensk. That city, defended by 80,000 Russians, was take after a bloody battle, the enemy setting it on fire in thei retreat (August 17).

The Russians then continually retired, laying waste the country burning the cities and villages, destroying the corn and crops Napoleon needed a great victory; he lost his chance at Valoutin owing to a blunder by Junot. The army of Barclay was in a ver critical position, but the battle became merely a rear-guar action.

Fortunately for the French, the czar replaced Barclay by th aged Kutusov, who decided to fight a battle in order to sav Moscow. The action took place at Borodino, near the Moskwa It was a terrible conflict, in which 270,000 men engaged wit violence, each army being determined to conquer. The Russia front was protected on the left by the ruins of a village an three redoubts, which Bagration was ordered to defend, and o the right by a great redoubt commanded by Barclay. Barclay' position was carried and retaken; finally Caulaincourt too it with a division of cuirassiers. A thousand cannon were engaged After a furious battle, the Russians at last gave way. In order t convert their defeat into a rout, the guards should have bee thrown into the battle, as all the marshals advised, but Napoleo felt keenly that, in the existing state of affairs, this was a wa of rashness, and having been rash, he was led to an excess caution. It was for this reason that he had halted at Viln instead of striking vigorously and at once; at the Borodin he dared not risk his reserves, as a result the battlefield remaine to the French, but the Russian army was not routed. Th Russians lost nearly 60,000 men (September 7); the Frenc losses were very heavy, 10,000 killed and 20,000 wounded forty-seven generals were wounded, two mortally, Montbru and Caulaincourt, and fifteen more severely, including Davou Ney and Murat, who remained all day in the midst of the mos terrible fire, were not hit; the former caused his men at on time to lie down in order to allow a storm of shot to pass ove them, and alone stood upright.

The French army entered Moscow, but the governor Rostopchine had evacuated almost the whole population and the Russian army had exhausted the supplies in the public stores. Fire completed the work. Flames appeared at different points and spread with the speed of powder in a city of wood. The fire lasted five days; it was only possible to save the churches, the Kremlin, and a fifth of the houses (September 16–20). Fifteen thousand wounded of the Russian army, who had been left in Moscow, perished in the flames.

The war of extermination became terrifying. The French had found a new Spain. Napoleon considered retiring to Poland and to his sources of supply, while threatening Petersburg at the same time; he considered an offensive retreat by the north-west, but his generals dissuaded him and urged him to await in Moscow the offers of the czar. They did not arrive; the overtures which Napoleon himself made were rejected with disdain, and precious time was lost during which the Russians restored their armies and winter came on. On October 13, a slight frost gave warning of what might be expected, despite the continued fine weather of a brilliant autumn, and inspired a desire for a retreat which the Russians were already threatening to cut off on the right flank. Napoleon, that he might not admit to the world that he was retreating, left Mortier with 10,000 men in the Kremlin, and marched directly upon Kutusov by the road to Kalouga.

The French left Moscow on October 19, thirty-five days after their entry. The army numbered 80,000 combatants and 600 cannon, but was accompanied by 50,000 servants, women, children, people of all kinds, and a crowd of waggons. The march was so hindered that Kutusov arrived first at Malo-Jaroslavetz, where a violent battle took place between the Russians and the French advance-guard under Eugène (October 24). The town was taken and retaken seven times, remaining eventually to the French. It was then an easy matter to force a passage, but the road to Kalouga was abandoned, with the result that a line of retreat through a rich and fertile country was exchanged for the wasted road through Mojaïsk by which the advance had been made. It was necessary to force a way through large enemy forces; the cold increased, snow fell heavily, and the disorder of the supply was aggravated. When Smolensk was reached, there were only 50,000 men in the ranks (November 9).

Napoleon had taken the most minute precautions for the provision of supplies and reinforcements along his line of retreat; the carelessness of his subordinates and the difficulty of enforcing

orders at such a distance in such a country made his forethought valueless. At Smolensk, where he hoped to find supplies and resources, all had been exhausted. But there was not a moment to lose. Wittgenstein with the army of the north approached the French right, after having, despite his defeat at Polotzk, forced St. Cyr and Victor to retreat; he had captured Witepsk on the Dwina. Tchitchagoff, thanks to the retirement of the Austrian Schwartzenberg, who was already a traitor, occupied Minsk, behind the Beresina, with an army drawn from the banks of the Danube. Kutusov fell upon Orcha and Borisow in order to aid his two lieutenants. The three Russian forces hastened to unite in order to bar the Beresina to the passage of the French army.

The French resumed their march, but on November 14, 15, and 16, the thermometer suddenly fell to sixteen and eighteen degrees of frost. All vegetation disappeared; nourishment for the horses failed, they died in thousands. The cavalry were thus converted into infantry. It was necessary to abandon and to destroy a great part of the artillery and much of the supplies. The enemy saw in the roads the traces of this terrible disaster and hastened to profit by it. He enveloped the French columns with a cloud of Cossacks, who like the Arabs of the desert cut off every straggler. On the following days the weather grew warmer, but another scourge fell upon the French—seas of liquid mud which prevented all advance and increased the danger of famine.

The retreat of the French, cruel by the inclemency of the weather and still more by lack of food, was nothing but one long battle. In order to deliver Davout, surrounded by a Russian army, Napoleon was forced to charge in person at Krasnoi at the head of his guards. They numbered 10,000; they cut their way through 60,000 of the enemy and brought relief to Davout, but the whole Russian army fell on Ney, who had only 6000 men. Three times this heroic soldier, "whose heart was as tempered steel," according to the verdict of Napoleon, made his way through the enemy who surrounded him and three times they again encircled him. The Russians thought that they had captured him at last, "the bravest of the brave," but he escaped them and the grand army was once more reunited at Orcha (November 19). With the corps of Oudinot, Victor, and Dombrowski, it was still 40,000 strong, a third of that number being Poles. Napoleon relied on crossing the Beresina by the bridge of Borisof, but the Russians had burned it and Tchitchagoff held, on the further bank, the road to Minsk which the French

expected to follow. A ford was luckily discovered to the north of Borisof, at Studzianka. The river, forty yards broad, was filled with great blocks of ice; General Eblé and his engineers, wading shoulder-deep in the water, established two bridges fifty-four yards long, built from the beams of the houses of Studzianka which were demolished (November 26). The bridges were many times broken and had to be remade. Almost all the bridge-builders either perished of cold or were drowned. At last while Ney and Oudinot on the right bank contained the army of Tchitchagoff, and Victor, on the left bank, held that of Wittgenstein in check, the guards under Napoleon, accompanied by Eugène and Davout, crossed the river. Victor, who had only 15,000 men against the 46,000 Russians of Wittgenstein, and whose position was unfavourable, none the less succeeded in checking the enemy, held him, killed or wounded 10,000 men, and crossed the pontoons in the course of the night. On November 29, there remained only on the left bank a rear-guard and a crowd of camp-followers who, having found fuel and food at Studzianka, refused to move. When in the morning they found the rear-guard about to cross the bridges, they hurled themselves upon them. The result was a horrible medley of cavalry, infantry, supplies, and fugitives. The Russians appeared and rained shells on this disorderly crowd. This terrible scene has remained famous as the Passage of the Beresina. The governor of Minsk caused 24,000 corpses to be collected and cremated.

Napoleon directed his retreat towards Vilna, where the French had a large store of supplies. At Smorgoni he left the army to return in haste to Paris, where the conspiracy of Malet had come to a head, to guard against the disastrous effects of the news of the retreat, and to collect a new army. Murat, whom he had left in command, had neither the authority nor the energy demanded by the circumstances. Cold increased to twenty degrees of frost and 20,000 men perished in three days. The enemy, though themselves only able to march slowly, reached Vilna before the French. Ney held them in check for some time at the head of a handful of brave men, defending the bridge of Kowno, where he fought as a common soldier, musket in hand. He was the last to recross the Niemen (December 30). There the retreat and the disastrous campaign came to an end. Beyond that river the French left, dead or prisoners, 300,000 soldiers. And yet they had not once been defeated. The winter and the want of food, not the enemy, had slain the grand army. The Russians themselves, used as they were to their terrible climate, had suffered

horribly. The army of Kutusov in three weeks had lost thre quarters of its effectives.

The French armies had not been more successful in Spai After the departure of the emperor divided command and t feebleness of Joseph Bonaparte had paralysed all the efforts the 300,000 veterans whom Napoleon had successively sent the The campaign of 1810 was marked by a dual attempt of Sou against Cadiz in Andalusia, and of Masséna against the impre nable lines of the Torres Vedras, which Wellington had skilful prepared at the extremity of Portugal. The campaign of 18 was marked by the indecisive Battle of Fuentes d'Onoro betwe Masséna and Wellington, while in 1812 the English general to Ciudad Rodrigo and Badajoz, and defeated Marmont at Arapil near Salamanca, a reverse which destroyed all the importan of the successes gained by Suchet in the east of the peninsula.

German Campaign (1813).—The retreat from Moscow stru a mortal blow at the power of Napoleon. The King of Prus joined the czar and the unfortunate French armies had to retre from the Niemen to the Vistula, from the Vistula to the Od from the Oder to the Elbe. A sixth coalition was formed. consisted of England, Russia, Prussia, Sweden, and Spai Austria was secretly arming to join these powers. What aggr vated the peril was that the allied sovereigns appealed to t most energetic of popular passions, national sentimer "Germans," said Wittgenstein, "we open the Prussian ran to you, you will find the sons of labourers at the side of the so of princes. Every distinction of rank is effaced by these gre ideas: the king, liberty, honour, and country!" And Germar tramped for six months by the feet of French soldiers, listen with a fierce resolution to the words of her princes and her poe The verses of Uhland, of Professor Arndt, and of Koerner we sung in castle and in cottage. And already it seemed insufficie to make the French recross Germany; there was talk of taki again from France her provinces of Alsace and Lorraine whi the coalition regarded as German territory. And so by h faults France turned against herself that great wave of patri ism which saved her in 1792.

But in the meantime Napoleon displayed his usual activit while there was hardly a family in France who did not mourn victim of these long wars, France silently and sadly continued give him her sons to fight his battles. "The new levies," said minister of this time, "offered themselves without delay, witho resistance." Napoleon mobilised an army of 200,000 men a

was ready before the coalition. He threw them back beyond the Elbe by his splendid victory of Lützen. "During the twenty years I have commanded the French armies," he cried, "I have never seen greater bravery, greater devotion. My young soldiers! honour and courage come from your every pore!" (May 2.) But the cavalry had been left on the frozen steppes of Russia: Napoleon could not pursue his vanquished foes and Lützen proved a sterile victory. The enemy was defeated again at Bautzen, Saxony was delivered, Silesia half conquered. At this point Napoleon halted and unfortunately accorded the enemy the armistice of Pleiswitz (June 3) in the hope that two months' respite would double his forces. The coalition breathed again and regained confidence.

In Spain Wellington, bolder since his victory of Arapiles, took the offensive, and defeated Joseph at Vittoria. This defeat—the Battle of Leipzic of the south—led to the loss of Spain. Suchet found himself uncovered after the retreat of the armies of Portugal and Castille into the Pyrenees; he evacuated Valence and Barcelona and retired to Figuières where he was protected by the Pyrenees. Soult took up his position behind the Nive, but the English were none the less on the Bidassoa, the soil of France was about to be invaded. This event made a profound sensation. Napoleon was not disturbed. Austria demanded that if the coalition laid down arms Napoleon should abandon the grand-duchy of Warsaw, of Illyria, the Hanseatic towns, and the protectorate of the Confederation of the Rhine. These concessions would have taken nothing from the greatness of France, who would have kept the line of the Rhine and the Alps and beyond that barrier Holland and Italy with the two crowns of Murat and Jerome. Unfortunately for France and for himself, Napoleon refused these demands. Austria had declared that in the event of his refusal she would join her 300,000 men to the armies of the allies. She kept her word. On August 16 hostilities commenced, the cannon thundered on a line of 150 leagues, from Bohemia and the banks of the Katzbach as far as Hamburg.

The coalition faced Napoleon with 500,000 soldiers having with them 1500 cannon and a reserve, ready to enter the lines, of 250,000 men. Two Frenchmen were in these ranks: Bernadotte, the Prince Royal of Sweden, and Moreau, the victor of Hohenlinden, who at the request of the czar had returned from America to direct this mortal blow against his own country. Napoleon had said of Bernadotte, who owed France the crown of Sweden: "In taking a wife one does not renounce one's mother: much less does one attack her and tear her to pieces."

And history gives no other verdict. The allies, always defeate in spite of their superior numbers, adopted the tactics of refusin battle at the hands of their indomitable adversary and acceptin it only from his lieutenants.

The emperor had only 360,000 men at his disposal on th Elbe ; presuming too much on the powers of his forces in spit of the inequality of numbers between them and the enemy, h threatened simultaneously Berlin, Breslau, and Prague, whic weakened his centre, and Dresden, where he struck a terribl blow at the coalition on the 26th and 27th of August. At thi battle one deserter at least was punished : Moreau was suggest ing a manœuvre to the czar when a bullet from the Frenc Guard broke both his thighs ; he died four days later. But whil the great army of Bohemia fled in disorder across the mountain from which it had descended, Napoleon learned that Macdonal had sustained a disaster on the Katzbach (August 26-29) an that Oudinot had been defeated on the 23rd at Gross-Beeren on the way to Berlin. These bad tidings prevented him fron personally directing the pursuit of the vanquished army an accomplishing its utter destruction. Vandamme, who had bee launched unsupported on Bohemia, was taken prisoner at Kuln on August 30. This reverse equalised the victory of Dresden i leaving the Austrians the support of the Bohemian mountain with the facility of descending from them at will to turn th French right. The defeat of Macdonald had occasioned the los of Silesia and brought Blücher to Saxony. The defeat of Oudinot and that which Ney sustained at Dennewitz (September 6) i attempting to reopen the way to Berlin, allowed Bernadotte t make his way to Wittenberg where he joined forces with Blücher Davout, who was already in the centre of Mecklenburg where h had taken Wismar, was obliged to follow the general movemen of retreat behind the Elbe. From Wittenberg as far as Toeplit the coalition armies formed a vast semicircle of 300,000 sabre or bayonets which menaced the French front, while the extre mities of this semicircle strove to unite behind the French armie and so close their way back to France. They gave a helpin hand to Germany which was mobilising, to Bavaria whic joined the coalition, and to Baden and Würtemburg whic followed their example. Napoleon tried yet once again to cu this circle ; he concentrated his forces at Leipzic and engage in a general battle. This day's work, which the Germans calle the *battle of nations*, was the most deadly struggle of moder history. One hundred and ninety thousand French soldier

sustained for three days the furious attack of 300,000 men of the coalition. The Saxons and the cavalry of Würtemburg crossed over to the enemy on the field of battle and fired their cannon, still charged with French shot, on the French soldiers. Although the French had not yet lost one of their positions, the reserves of artillery were exhausted ; at the end of the third day there were only 15,000 rounds of ammunition left, that is to say, barely enough for two hours' fighting, and the numbers of the enemy steadily increased. As in 1812, it was necessary to retreat in order to escape defeat, and as in 1812 this voluntary retreat became a disaster. Napoleon, in order not to reveal his intentions too soon, delayed throwing bridges across the Elster and the Pleisse ; only one long narrow bridge had been thrown across the divided branches of the two rivers. From that cause an immense congestion arose ; it led to delay and then to a fatal error ; one of the engineers blew up the bridge over the Elster before the last part of the army with the two marshals and the commanders of corps had crossed. The valiant Poniatowski was drowned in the river ; Macdonald swam across; Lauriston and Reynier were taken. One hundred and twenty thousand men, of whom 50,000 were French, spent the night on these mournful plains (October 16-19).

The army still found the way barred at Hanau by 60,000 Austro-Bavarian troops ; Drouot's artillery and the guard pierced a bloody passage by which the army passed through. "Our cannon," said an eye-witness, "rolled over a mass of human bodies." Hanau was the last victory of the French beyond the Rhine (October 30). Only a fifth of the French army re-entered France ; 120,000 soldiers remained inactive on the Elbe, the Oder, and the Vistula, where they were besieged. Rapp made a heroic defence for a whole year before Dantzic ; Davout came out of Hamburg when and how he would after the abdication of Napoleon. Du Tailly at Torgau did not open his gates till his last horse had been eaten. Other fine defences must be mentioned : those of Lapoype at Wittenberg ; Lemarois at Magdeburg ; Grandeau at Stettin ; Ravier at Damm ; Fornier d'Albe at Custrin ; and Laplane at Glogau. History owes at least remembrance to these brave men, who far from France and from all help, kept the French flag flying as proudly as in the days of her victories.

Campaign in France (1814).—A unanimous reawakening of the national spirit might have saved France, but that resource was broken ; the very sources of the virility of the population were exhausted. In any case the people of the towns and of the

country were not mobilised; it was not till the 5th of March five months after the arrival of Wellington in France, tha Napoleon proclaimed, too late, the levy *en masse*, the nationa insurrection. The bourgeoisie who had welcomed his dictator ship at the time when it saved the country from disorder, repelle it now when it was leading the country to an abyss. At th moment when the whole nation should have rallied roun Napoleon, the liberals gave the signal for an unseasonable an unfortunate opposition. His enemies made good use of thes first symptoms of lassitude and approaching defection. The published the famous proclamation of Frankfort in which the protested "that they did not make war against France, bu against the preponderance which Napoleon had too long exer cised outside the limits of his own empire." And they offere peace on the condition that France should retreat within he natural boundaries. By these propositions the allies sought t separate the emperor from the nation. They succeeded; th legislative body, from which Napoleon demanded energeti measures, replied by complaining of the despotism of war. "I this the time to speak of mistakes," cried the emperor, "when 200,000 Cossacks are crossing our frontiers? There is n question of individual liberty or safety; there is only questio of national independence!" And he was right; had he no already held the dictatorship, it was at that moment that Franc would have required to give it to him. The legislative body wa adjourned for an indefinite period. Napoleon himself decide the measures of the budget, sent the pope back to Italy, Ferdin and VII. to Spain, and prepared for a supreme struggle.

He had only 60,000 soldiers against the 360,000 who wer advancing divided in two great armies: that of Silesia unde Blücher, that of Bohemia under Schwartzenberg. The firs crossed the Rhine, the Moselle, and the Meuse without resistance the second, violating Swiss neutrality, debouched by the gap o Belfort and the Jura. They had to connect their communication by the plateau of Langres. In the south 160,000 English an Spanish troops under Wellington crossed the Pyrenees; in th south-east 80,000 Austrians approached the Alps; on the north east 80,000 Swedes, Prussians, and Russians under Bernadott threatened Belgium. And as if these immense forces were no enough, 400,000 reserves were raised behind these active armies So that more than a million armed men were about to be pre cipitated on France.

Napoleon hastened on the 26th January, 1814, to Vitry-le

François. In order to separate the armies of Silesia and Bohemia, he attacked and defeated Blücher at St. Dizier (27th), then at Brienne (29th), but without being able to prevent his reunion with Bernadotte; a check sustained on the Rothière (February 1) forced him to fall back on Troyes. Some days later (February 8) he received a final ultimatum from the allies. This time they did not even accord the natural boundaries of the Alps and the Rhine, but asked that France should return within her frontiers of 1789. The emperor was advised to accept these terms. "That I should abandon the conquests made before my time!" he cried. "That I should leave France smaller than I found her! Never!"

But the allies separated to march simultaneously on Paris by the valleys of the Seine and Marne. Napoleon, who knew every inch of the ground in the bare plains of Champagne, watched every movement of his adversaries and profited by their slightest imprudence. One hundred and twenty thousand Prussians extended from Châlons to La Ferté-sous-Jouarre: Napoleon cut through this long column at Champaubert on February 10 and separated Sacken from Blücher; on the 11th he defeated Sacken at Montmirail and pursued him to Château-Thierry where he beat him again on the 13th and then allowed him to fly towards the north. Napoleon now turned on Blücher and by an impetuous attack at Vauchamps on the 14th he forced him back into Châlons. Napoleon had won four victories in five days. But while he was on the banks of the Marne, Schwartzenberg advanced by the valley of the Seine; his advanced guard had already passed Melun. The French army marched thirty leagues in thirty-six hours; on February 16th it encountered and drove the Austrians before it to Mormant, and on the 17th to Nangis and Donnemarie. A body of 30,000 men had ventured to advance as far as Fontainebleau. A mistake on the part of Marshal Victor, who was several hours late in arriving at Montereau, allowed them to escape. Their rear-guard only was destroyed there on the 18th, and another check at Méry-sur-Seine on the 22nd precipitated their retreat. In eight days the Austrians had lost fifty leagues and the French army returned in triumph to Troyes.

But unfortunately this pursuit of the Austrians on the upper reaches of the Seine left the approaches to Paris on the north-east unguarded. Blücher, who had reformed his army, marched a second time on Paris by the Marne; Napoleon rushed at him and threw him in disorder on Soissons. Blücher appeared to be

lost; Soissons opened its gates to him and saved him. The tow was taken by the army of the north: the Prussians took refu there and doubled their forces. They were beaten none the less Craonne, but they concentrated their forces near Laon to t number of 100,000 men and held this strong position in spite of a the efforts of the emperor to dislodge them (March 10). Napole then turned against the Russians and drove them from Rein (March 13). Schwartzenberg, who during the absence of t little French army had advanced as far as Provins, two day march from Paris, was alarmed on seeing the French return o his flank; he stopped and recoiled; the approaches of Par were once more freed from the enemy.

And so in one month Napoleon had fought fourteen battle achieved twelve victories, and defended the approaches of h capital against three great enemy armies. The allies, perturbe for a moment, had accepted the overture of a congress at Chati lon without any serious desire to bring this great struggle to a end. As for Napoleon, he had already said: "I have sworn t maintain the integrity of the territory of the republic; if th allies persist in desiring to dismember France, I desire onl three things: to conquer, to die, or to abdicate." The congre was broken off (March 10).

The struggle became more and more unequal. The defectio of Murat, who thought in that way to save his crown, delivere Italy to the Austrians. Augereau after simulating battle opene the gates of Lyons, the second town of France, to the Austrian General Maison evacuated Belgium. Finally the English und Wellington, whose advance Soult had been powerless to arres carried Bordeaux, where Louis XVIII. was proclaimed kir (March 12). In the interior the royalists were stirring up agit tion. "You could do everything, and you dare nothing," wro Talleyrand to the kings of the allies; "dare therefore on more."

The czar wished to bring this struggle, which astonished th world and which was a last affront to the coalition, to an en He commanded Blücher and Schwartzenberg to unite the forces and to march together on Paris. Napoleon tried in va to prevent this union: the sanguinary battle of Arcis-sur-Aub was indecisive (March 20 and 21). He made the bold resolutio to leave the way to Paris open, to march with 50,000 men to S Dizier on the rear of the allies. There he would cut their con munications, excite the courage of those provinces which r mained patriotic, but which had paid no attention to the decr

of March 5 ordering a levy *en masse*, enlarge his army with part of the garrisons of the towns on the Moselle and the forces of the insurrection, then return and overwhelm the enemy by some terrible blow. Paris must defend herself, but not one foreigner would recross the Rhine. "I shall be nearer Munich," said Napoleon, "than they near Paris."

But Paris offered no defence. Had all available resources been utilised, an army of 70,000 combatants could have been collected. There were 8000 men in the depôts of the guard and of the line; more than 20,000 conscripts or soldiers in the barracks of the surrounding districts; 2000 officers without commissions; and 12,000 National Guards. And Marmont and Mortier were under the walls of Paris with 13,000 men of the active army. Twenty thousand labourers, for the most part old soldiers, pressed on the doors of the mayoralties demanding arms; they were sent away. The arsenals contained 400 cannon, 20,000 new muskets, and 5,000,000 cartridges. Grenelle alone possessed 300 milliers of powder and the military authorities manufactured every day 60,000 rations. They were allowed to fall into the hands of the enemy while the French lacked munitions, lacked bread. Four cannon were placed on the rising ground at Chaumont, six on Montmartre, and only 22,000 men took part in the Battle of Paris at the villages of Pantin, La Villette, Belleville, Romainville, and at the barrier of Clichy, against the 80,000 Austrians of Schwartzenberg and the 100,000 Prussians of Blücher (March 30). The resistance was as heroic as it was useless. "They are too many!" cried the soldiers as they fell. The allies lost 18,000 men, nearly as many as the French possessed altogether. Marshal Marmont signed an armistice and a capitulation to save Paris the horrors of capture by assault (March 31).

Abdication of the Emperor (April 6, 1814).—Astonished by such a victory, the foreigners entered into the great city with respectful fear. They showed the greatest moderation. The czar protested that the nation had only to state its wishes and he was ready to accept them. The people showed a sombre resignation; but the senate, convoked and directed by Talleyrand, named on April 1st a provisional government. On the 3rd it pronounced the disinheritance of Napoleon; on the 6th it adopted a new constitution and called a prince unknown to the nation to the throne; a prince of whom the allies had only heard in the last few days, Louis XVIII., a brother of Louis XVI.

Napoleon still had imposing forces at Fontainebleau: wit the armies of Eugène, of Suchet, and of Soult, who had engage Wellington in the heroic Battle of Toulouse, Napoleon coul muster 140,000 tried soldiers behind the Loire. For an instan he had thoughts of fighting, but his generals were war-weary Marmont betrayed him by the capitulation of Essonne; Ne and Berthier deserted him. Then he abdicated. Nine days late he said farewell to his old guard in the court of the *Cheval Blan* and left for the island of Elba (April 20). An island of a fe thousand square yards was now the whole empire of a man wh for fifteen years had reigned over half of Europe. A sma number of his faithful servitors followed him into his exile Bertrand, Drouot, Cambronne, and about 400 men of the ol guard.

And so the fight to the death which England had undertake against France was finished: English gold had won.

Napoleon had thought that his hatred against the aristocrac of Britain was shared by Europe; he had taken the empire o the earth in order to fight against the mistress of the seas. I the midst of this gigantic struggle, the question of the publi liberty of France, of the rights of sovereigns, and the indepen dence of nations had disappeared.

For ten years Napoleon had gone from victory to victory— to Milan, to Vienna, to Berlin, to Lisbon; but the unassailabl enemy had always escaped him. Then he conceived the ma idea of going yet as far as Moscow, and that while his best troop were far away in Spain and while German soil, deeply under mined, trembled beneath his steps. On the return journe winter had killed his great army. Then the peoples which Franc had crushed rose against her; in France herself the liberal refused their support. The Colossus fell; and in his fall h seemed to drag the country down along with him. But sh pardoned him everything, for she owed to him her incomparabl glory.

She owed him victories gained by superiority of genius instea of superiority of numbers; she owed him the accomplishmen of immense public works; she owed him awakened industry agriculture encouraged by the security given to those wh had acquired national property; enlightened administration vigilant and rapid; the consolidated unity of the country, it greatness surpassing all dreams—all these plead for Napoleo to posterity and to the heart of France.

Besides all that, in spite of his kingly court, his nobility, and i

some respects in spite of himself, Napoleon remained always for France the representative, and for Europe the armed soldier, of the Revolution. He had upheld civil institutions, "the grand social result," as he said, "which was worth all that he had suffered for it," and which was one day to bring back to its true path the liberty he had pushed aside. He had spread that spirit wherever he had led his armies. In crowning commoners and parvenus, in forcing the kings and emperors of the old dynasties to become the courtiers of his plebeian fortunes, he had destroyed the old prestige of the "monarchy by divine right."

Spain, Italy, Germany, emerged trembling from his hands; in order to overthrow him, kings were compelled to proclaim the rights of peoples. He himself always recognised his true origin in the great moments of his destiny: "They wish," he said one day in speaking of an attempt on his life by the royalists, "they wish to destroy the Revolution in attacking my person; I defend it for I am the Revolution." In the midst of the unheard-of splendours of Dresden and Erfurt, kings and princes listened in surprise and embarrassment to his recollections of his life as a second-lieutenant of artillery. When in 1814 the deputies, mistaking the spirit of the age, bargained for authority with him who alone could save France, he invoked again for himself the right of representing the people, that is to say, of defending them. Led by their fine instinct, the people were never deceived: they who had paid with their blood for all the victories of the emperor, they loved, they regretted Napoleon.

And now this powerful warrior and administrator, the greatest figure of military history, had left France smaller than he found her, without men or money, deprived of eighteen departments which the republic had given her and which she had still possessed on the 18th Brumaire under the protection of the victories of Zürich and Bergen. Faults of policy had been the undoing of this invincible general. It is often questioned whether France did not pay too dear for this ephemeral power. History may perhaps find in this marvellous but terrible epic one of the most memorable examples of the expiation which always follows great mistakes. The disasters claimed two victims, but both were equally guilty, the emperor and France. The one ten years after the Revolution reconstituted the ancient regime on the old lines and precipitated himself into the abyss, because he refused to curb either his ambition or his genius. The other merited its misfortunes in throwing itself, like a lost child, into the arms of a young and glorious general; in order to escape at last when

tired of his government, it allowed that which it had cast dow to rise again. Former generations have their share of respons bility for the misfortunes of France, for in making Napole omnipotent they gave him the dangerous stimulant of absolu power.

CHAPTER LXVII

THE FIRST RESTORATION AND THE HUNDRED DAYS (1814–181

The First Restoration (April 6, 1814, to March 20, 1815).—Wh the great exile was travelling through France exposed to attempt at assassination, and, in the south, to insults, M. Talleyrand, the real head of the provisional government, sign on April 23 a disastrous convention which reduced the frontie of France to those of January 1, 1792, and ceded to the alli fifty-three strongholds, thirteen thousand cannon, thirty vesse and twelve frigates.

On the very day on which Napoleon left Fontainebleau, Lo XVIII. quitted his residence, Hartwell, near London, and April 24 embarked for Calais. The words put into the mouth the Count of Artois, "Gentlemen, there is in France but o more Frenchman," should have been the sentiment of all t Bourbons, since it was necessary at all costs to secure a measu of popularity for these princes who had during twenty-four yea been strangers to the country, who owed their gains to the loss of France and their power to her enemies. But the new monarc who named himself "King by the grace of God" without taki into account the will of the nation; who tore down the tricolo to replace it by the white flag, no longer recognised by t soldiers of France; who, finally, dated his accession from t death of his nephew, Louis XVII., and called 1814 the nineteen year of his reign, was hardly one to make concessions. T Emperor Alexander disliked the Bourbons and understood th that the revolutions of France would not cease, nor would pea in Europe be assured, except by liberal and strong institutio which would effectually prevent a return to the *ancien régi* He upheld the constitutional propositions drawn up by M. Talleyrand and a commission of senators and deputies. May 2, before entering Paris, the king was obliged to ma the declaration of St. Ouen, which promised a representati government and the maintenance of the first conquests of t

Revolution. This declaration was replaced by the constitutional charter which was suspended on May 27 and finally granted on June 4. The following were its principles:

Hereditary royalty.

Two chambers, one elective, the other, the Chamber of Peers, appointed by the king, both having the right to vote upon taxation and to discuss the laws.

Public and individual liberty, liberty of the press and of worship.

The inviolability of property, even that acquired as a result of confiscation.

Responsibility of the ministers.

The immovability of judges.

The security of the public debt; the maintenance of pensions, grades, military honours of the old and new nobility, of the Legion of Honour, the cross of which was to be stamped with the likeness of Henry IV. instead of that of Napoleon.

The free admittance of all Frenchmen to all civil and military appointments.

The maintenance of the great institutions of the emperor: the Council of State, the Court of Cassation, the Court of Accounts, and the University.

The Emperor Alexander would not assent to the evacuation of France until the Constitutional Charter had been drawn up. On its acceptance, however, he and his allies signed the peace on the basis adopted by M. Talleyrand on April 23, and the evacuation of France by enemy troops began on May 30.

The charter satisfied the middle class. As the empire had fallen it was consoled for the loss of glory and power by the hope of having at least found repose and liberty. But the Bourbons had brought back with them the emigrants who threatened the new interests created by the Revolution. They disturbed the possessors of confiscated property. They respected neither freedom of worship nor religious toleration; they elected as minister of war General Dupont, who was known as the author of the first French reverse, the capitulation of Baylen; they distributed public honours in the name of Georges Cadoudal and Moreau, who were notoriously guilty, one of attempt at assassination and the other of treason. The king signed his ordinances with the old formula of Louis XIV.: "for such is our pleasure." Titles and honours were lavished on the emigrants, while fourteen thousand officers who had won their epaulettes in battle against the enemy were retired on half pay. Soldiers of Condé's army,

many of whom had never wielded a sword, became generals. Naval officers received the rank next superior to that which they had held previous to their emigration; those who had served in the British fleet retained the rank bestowed upon them by English admirals. Campaigns in which they had fought against France counted towards their pension. In ten months the government of Louis XVIII. had exhausted its credit.

Return from the Island of Elba (March 20, 1815).—Meanwhile, from the island of Elba Napoleon listened to all the rumours which came from France. He saw the mistakes of the Bourbons accumulate, their unpopularity increase. Threatened with removal from his island and with being placed on some still more solitary rock, he resolved once more to try his fortune. He embarked with some hundreds of men and landed near Cannes in the department of Var on March 1. "Frenchmen," he said in a proclamation, "raised to the throne by your choice, everything that has been done without your sanction is unlawful. Soldiers, all those whom we have seen during the last twenty-five years labouring to stir up enemies against us all over Europe, who have spent their lives in fighting against us in the ranks of foreign armies—are they to be allowed to enchain our eagles? Come! take your stand beneath the banners of your chief; he has no existence but in you; his rights are but those of the people and yourselves; his interest, his honour, and his glory are but your interest, your honour, and your glory. Victory will follow in the wake of our charge, the eagle with the national colours, the eagle will fly from pinnacle to pinnacle until, finally, it will float from the towers of Notre-Dame."

From Cannes to Grenoble the little troop met with no obstacle. "Citizens," said the emperor to the peasants, "I count on the people because I am a man of the people." He frankly acknowledged that he had been mistaken in wishing to give France the empire of the world, he spoke only of peace and liberty; he promised a constitution and guarantees.

Near Grenoble he met the first troops which had been sent against him. He went forward alone and said, "Is there a man among you who would slay your emperor?" The soldiers dropped their arms and answered by one great shout of "Vive l'empereur!" Labédoyère brought over to him the seventh regiment of the line; each soldier had resumed his tricolour cockade which had been religiously preserved at the bottom of his knapsack. After that the journey was a complete triumph. At Grenoble, the inhabitants themselves broke down the gates

of their town to gain him admittance; at Lyons, where he arrived on the tenth of the month, he had a similar welcome. He remained there until the thirteenth, exercising once more his sovereign power; Ney, who had left Paris a devoted servant of the king, saw his regiments yield to the universal impulse and came himself to rejoin his old chief at Auxerre. On the 20th of March, Napoleon re-entered the Tuileries, which Louis XVIII. had quitted the day before. Not a gun was fired in the defence of the Bourbons; it was not necessary to shed a drop of blood to bring about the re-establishment of the empire; an evidence that this unheard-of revolution was the result not of conspiracy but of universal desire.

The Hundred Days (March 20 to June 22).—The events which had taken place during the last year had taught Napoleon that he had left out of his government one of the active forces of France—the spirit of liberty. This force he now endeavoured to win, and in order to please the liberals he confided the ministry of the interior to Carnot, an upright republican. At the same time he suppressed the titles of the feudal nobility, broke down the trammels of the press, made the office of mayor once more elective, and said to Benjamin Constant, "I am not only, as they say, the emperor of the soldiers; I am also the emperor of the peasants, of the plebeians of France. In spite of all that has passed, you see how the people return to me. There is sympathy between us because I am risen from the ranks; I am different to the privileged classes. But I do not intend to be the king of a *jacquerie*. If there are ways of governing with a constitution, so much the better! See what can be done; bring me your ideas. Public discussions, free elections, responsible ministers, the liberty of the press—I want all these things—I do not hate liberty. I kept her at a distance when she barred my way; but I was brought up with her sentiments; I am growing old. At forty-five a man is not what he was at thirty. The ease of a constitutional king may suit me; it would most certainly suit my son."

L'Acte additionnel, a new constitution containing the principal provisions of the charter—two chambers, one hereditary, one elective, the liberty of the press, etc.—was promulgated in the solemn assembly of the *Champ de Mai* (May 26). Submitted to the people it was adopted by 1,500,000 votes to 4206.

Nevertheless, he had all Europe to fight against and, in addition to foreign war, he had civil war, the royalists having taken up arms in La Vendée. The allied sovereigns, then assembled

in congress at Vienna to divide the nations among them, declared that "Napoleon had placed himself outside the pale of civil and social relations and that as the enemy and disturber of the peace of the world he was delivered over to international justice." Thus the emperor was placed beyond the law, and not only the emperor, but France. "Let us set forth," they said, "to partition this ungodly land. We must exterminate this band of brigands which men call the French army. The world will never be able to rest in peace as long as there exists a French people. It must be converted into the people of Burgundy, Neustria, Aquitaine, etc. They will rend each other, but the world will have peace during many centuries." And Blücher promised the Prussian students that he would have Napoleon hanged.

These were the words of Brunswick at the time of the first coalition, and they excited in the eastern provinces an ardour almost equal to that of 1792. Burghers, artisans, peasants offered their aid. Federations were formed in several provinces. Brittany gave the signal. The confederates placed themselves at the disposition of the government; but Napoleon, the genius of order, did not approve of revolutionary forces. Those who were willing to join the regiments and place themselves under military law were accepted; the rest were meagrely provided with arms. But there was also in a section of the community an extreme weariness, and in the official quarters much distrust. The Chamber of Representatives evinced an opposition which cut Napoleon to the quick. "They wish," said he, "to bind the old arms of the emperor; to drive me into ways which are not my ways." He became conscious of a feeling of depression; he no longer believed in his good fortune: "I had," said he, "a presentiment of misfortune." Nevertheless, he employed all his energy; he worked sixteen hours out of the twenty-four. In fifty days a regular army of 182,000 men was organised. Another of 200,000 National Guards was prepared for the defence of the fortresses and as a reserve for the active army.

Such efforts were unnecessary for the allies; their troops were in readiness to enter the campaign. Austria sent towards the Rhine and the Alps 300,000 Germans; 170,000 Russians were due at Nuremberg towards the middle of June and at Mainz on July 1. In Belgium there were already 95,000 English and Dutch under Wellington, a methodical general who lacked great inspirations, but who left nothing to chance, and 124,000 Prussians under Blücher, an impetuous old man who was named

by his soldiers "Marshal Forward" (Marschall Vorwärts). He had often led them to the rear, but he had just brought them from the Oder to the Seine and he now undertook to repeat the exploit. The arrival of the Russians was awaited in order to commence operations.

Battle of Waterloo (June 18, 1815).—The emperor decided to anticipate the enemy's attack, the offensive seemed to him more in keeping with the spirit of his nation, and he was especially loath to deliver up to the horrors of rapine the provinces of the north and east which had proved themselves so devoted to his cause and such ardent patriots. Besides, a great victory in Belgium might change many things.

"Soldiers!" said he at the climax of his proclamation to the troops, "for all Frenchmen of spirit, the moment has come to vanquish or to die," and he crossed the Sambre with 124,000 men and 350 cannon (June 15). He expected to surprise the Prussians, but Lieutenant-General Bourmont went over to the enemy, and Blücher, warned of the danger, had time to concentrate his forces at Ligny. The French advanced divided in three bodies: the right wing, 48,000 strong, under Grouchy; the centre, 28,000 strong, under the personal command of Napoleon; the left wing, 48,000 strong, under Marshal Ney. The right and the centre were to confront the Prussians; the left was to seize upon Quatre-Bras and arrest the progress of the English who could only debouch from that quarter, then to fall back upon the Prussians and complete their rout. But this plan was only half successful. The English, who were to have been forestalled at Quatre-Bras, had time to establish themselves in force, and Ney, fully occupied on his side, was unable to co-operate in the attack against the Prussians. The emperor had had a terrible engagement with the latter at Ligny which was twice taken and retaken. General Gerard, one of Grouchy's lieutenants, held his ground, however, and the enemy was put to flight after suffering considerable losses. But they were not destroyed as they might have been if the Count of Erlon, who commanded under Ney, deceived by inconsistent orders, had not marched his 20,000 men between Quatre-Bras and Ligny, and thus rendered them equally useless to both battles (June 16).

The Prussians seemed for the moment to be thrown back upon Namur; it was time to turn his attention to the English. Napoleon marched on them on the 17th. Wellington, surprised on the 16th, in the midst of a ball, by the news of the French approach, remained quite cool and made good his short-sighted-

ness by speedy action. That very night he collected 32,000 men at Quatre-Bras; within a few hours on the following day he assembled 70,000 before the village of Waterloo, on the plateau of Mont St. Jean. He had long studied this position. He had marked it out a year before in his despatches as an excellent method of covering Brussels on the side of the Sambre, the two roads of Nivelles and Charleroi joining at the foot of this plateau. He was determined to defend himself there to the last extremity.

Napoleon left Grouchy 34,000 men with orders to follow the Prussians towards Namur. He himself, with the rest of his forces, joined Ney in order to attack the English. The French army numbered only 72,000 men, but was full of enthusiasm. Wellington, with his back against the forest of Soignes, having only one road upon which to retreat, would be lost unless he conquered. Blücher and he had agreed that the one who was attacked should make a desperate resistance in order to allow time for the other to come to the rescue. Wellington only half kept his word during the day of Ligny; Blücher, unfortunately, kept his fully on the day of Waterloo. The English general sent word to Blücher to send him two of his corps; he replied that he would come with all. Wellington counted therefore on the Prussians, but Napoleon hoped that the Prussians, pushed towards the Meuse or held back by Grouchy, would not arrive.

The rain which had fallen in torrents on the 17th and during the ensuing night had made the ground an expanse of mire. The artillery could only be moved with difficulty. At length, on the 18th, about eleven o'clock, the sun appeared between the clouds and the battle began. Napoleon first attacked the château of Goumont, on which Wellington's right rested, intending to draw off the principal forces of the enemy from that side and thin out its centre; then he would pierce the centre at the plateau of Mont St. Jean, the principal outlet of the forest of Soignes, to cut off the English from Brussels and throw their defeated right wing towards a roadless country which would lead them to Flanders, far from the Prussians and far from Antwerp, their base of operations. Wellington in fact brought the best of his troops to the defence of Goumont, and an appalling struggle raged there for four hours; the English held the position.

During this feint attack, Napoleon collected a powerful battery of seventy-eight pieces and directed a tremendous fire upon Mont St. Jean, then threw Ney upon La Haie Sainte, a hamlet which was situated at the foot of the hill. This move at first succeeded. The heavy artillery of the marshal made

frightful ravages in the English ranks. For a moment they seemed disconcerted, a few fled; Wellington was obliged to hasten to them and rally them to the fight. At this moment, Ney decided to profit by the panic which he observed in certain sections of the English army. He took up a part of his artillery to place it on the enemy's own positions; these, when the firing ceased, closed up their lines. There was a ravine to cross; the heavy pieces became entangled in it and were with difficulty dragged up the opposite slope; a regiment went to protect it, but before it had time to form up, Wellington hurled two regiments of dragoons at full tilt into the valley. They cut the traces, killed the horses, and sabred the artillerymen. They in their turn were charged and cut down by the French cavalry; but a terrible disorder had been produced.

Ney, however, continually advancing, finally reached La Haie Sainte and took possession of it. The English army was a second time thrown into confusion; the fugitives carried the rumour of Wellington's defeat as far as Brussels. To turn this confusion into a rout, Napoleon was about to charge with his guard. Suddenly, the roar of cannon was heard behind the French lines. "Is it Grouchy?" was heard on all sides.

It was Bülow who was debouching on the right of the French army with thirty thousand Prussians, brought up through Wavres when they were believed to be near Namur, and they sent their shells to the very foot of the hillock on which Napoleon was stationed. The emperor was forced to send Lobau's corps against them as well as the guard which had been destined to support Ney. Wellington recognised the promised aid; he took the offensive on the side towards La Haie Sainte. But the French infantry drove back his columns, their cuirassiers struck them down, crossing a steep slope and arriving in the midst of the English position. Seeing this, Ney, who had been ordered by Napoleon to stand on the defensive, was unable to resist the ardour of his men. The whole French cavalry, even the reserves, rushed confusedly over the fatal plateau to cut down the enemy's cavalry. The latter, opening to right and left, unmasked sixty pieces of cannon which vomited death, and the whole of Wellington's infantry formed in squares. The French cavalry charged the English lines; eleven times they charged and sabred them; several were broken, but they formed anew. If the French infantry of the reserve had then been disengaged, the English army would have had no chance. Unfortunately, however, this infantry was with Lobau to hold Bülow. At seven o'clock the

French cavalry were thrown back from the plateau ; they had occupied it for two hours.

By this time, Napoleon was able to form a column of four battalions of the guard ; but he was too late ; the English army had reappeared at the crest of the plateau and battered in the column with cannon fire. The French advanced calmly with shouldered arms and refrained from firing a shot. Twice the English artillery thundered, twice the ranks formed up again and the column continued its march. At the third only it crumpled up ; two battalions had been entirely destroyed by the shells. Napoleon then summoned the troops which were occupying Goumont, joined them to those of Ney, inspirited them by a few words, and ordered a general attack. It was eight o'clock in the evening. The French soldiers charged the enemy with admirable enthusiasm ; several of the English squares were broken through and cut to pieces ; Wellington was in the thick of the fray. "What are your orders?" they asked him. "None." "But you may be killed, and it is important that he who takes your place should know your ideas." "My ideas! I have none except to hold on here as long as I may." If Wellington was not that day a great tactician, he certainly deserved his nickname, "The Iron Duke."

Suddenly a tremendous cannonade was heard on the extreme right of the French army. "It is Grouchy!" the soldiers again cried out. "It can be none other than Grouchy," thought Napoleon. But it was a third enemy ; it was Blücher who, at the head of 36,000 Prussians, was coming up after Bülow on the right flank of the French. Then the French soldiers believed they were betrayed. Some raised the cry of "*Sauve qui peut!*" and the last army of France, pressed in front by all that remained of Wellington's 70,000 men, on the right by the 66,000 Prussians of Blücher and Bülow, was dashed together, the ranks all in disorder ; soon there was nothing but a dreadful confusion.

Napoleon, in desperation, drew his sword and was about to rush into the midst of the enemy ; he wished to perish with his fortunes. His generals surrounded him and dragged him on the road to Genappe. It was after nine o'clock ; night had fallen on this terrible battlefield and still the struggle continued. The old guard formed six squares ; five were successively destroyed by an enemy thirty times its number ; one only still remained for a time, that of Cambronne. These brave men refused to put down their arms ; their chief answered to a summons by a valiant phrase which has become a by-word : "The guard dies, it does

not surrender." Alone against a whole army they charged it with their bayonets to gain time for their beloved chief to escape. Their sacrifice was rewarded and won them immortal glory.

The Battle of Waterloo lasted ten hours: "a day of giants," which cost the French 30,000 men killed, wounded, or prisoners, and the victors 22,000 men. Seventy-two thousand French struggled there against an enemy 115,000 strong and twice beheld victory slipping from their grasp.

So ended this four days' campaign.

But for the delays on the 15th and the deserters who gave warning to Blücher, the allies, surprised, would have suffered an irremediable disaster. If, on the 16th, Erlon's corps had been able to go into action, the Prussians would have been defeated at Ligny or the English at Quatre-Bras.

If, on the 18th, the Prussians had been unable to join Wellington, the English would have been crushed at Waterloo.

Second Abdication of the Emperor (June 23, 1815).—The retreat was disastrous, like that of Leipzic and Moscow; no preparations had been made for a reverse: all material was lost. From Laon, where the army began to rally, Napoleon set out for Paris. He entered the capital at midnight and established himself at the Elysée. He counted on the patriotism of the chambers. "Let them stand by me," said he, "and nothing is lost." But Fouché, minister of the police, started a rumour that the emperor was meditating an 18th Brumaire, and the Chamber of Representatives, at the motion of La Fayette, proclaimed the country in danger, summoned the National Guard to defend it, and declared guilty of treason any one who should attempt to dissolve it.

Napoleon, amazed by this attack, attempted to reassure the deputies and made an appeal for unity. "I only see one man between us and peace," said La Fayette, "we have done enough for him; our duty is to save the fatherland." A message was sent to the emperor demanding his abdication. Napoleon resigned himself to his fate. "Frenchmen," said he, "I offer myself as a sacrifice to the hatred of the enemies of France; my political life is at an end: I proclaim my son Napoleon II., Emperor of the French."

The assembly accepted this declaration. The liberals hoped to save the country without the emperor's assistance. They appointed a provisional government and a special commission was charged to negotiate with the allies. But they refused all

offers of peace. Wellington and Blücher marched directly on Paris, an imprudent step. The débris of Waterloo and Grouchy's intact corps had concentrated near the capital where, joined by numerous reinforcements, they numbered 100,000 men. More than 60,000 National Guards and artisans defended the city which had been fortified on the north side. The allied army found themselves outnumbered by the French; but Fouché, president of the provisional government, wished to place the younger branch of the Bourbons on the throne or, if he could not succeed in this design, to revert to the elder branch.

When Napoleon offered to place himself at the head of troops pointing out how easy it would be to crush at any rate this first enemy, not only did Fouché answer by a refusal, but he compelled the emperor to quit La Malmaison, where he had retired.

St. Helena.—Threatened with being delivered up to the enemy, Napoleon departed for Rochefort, thinking of seeking an asylum in the United States. But all ways of escape were guarded; after much uncertainty he went on board an English vessel, the *Bellerophon*, and wrote to the English regent that admirable letter: "Your royal highness, exposed to the factions which divide my country and to the enmity of the great powers of Europe, I have ended my political career and I come, like Themistocles, to seat myself at the hearth of the British nation. I place myself under the protection of her laws, which I claim from your royal highness, as the most powerful, the most constant and the most generous of my enemies." The English government treated the man who so nobly claimed her hospitality as a prisoner of war. The emperor was taken to St. Helena, an island in the midst of the Atlantic under a burning sun, five hundred leagues from any land. From the deck of the *Bellerophon* Napoleon watched the French coast fade from his view and cried, "Farewell, land of the brave! Farewell, dear France! A few traitors less and thou shouldst once more be a great nation, mistress of the world!"

Not considering that the deadly climate and the weariness of solitude and inaction were sufficient suffering for the ardent genius who for fifteen years had astonished the world, the English ministry seemed determined to kill their immortal captive slowly, by dint of insults. Napoleon endured these tortures with calm and dignity. His one thought was for posterity and he occupied the mournful leisure of his captivity in dictating the history of his campaigns. After six years of moral suffering and material privation, he died at Longwood

at four a.m. on May 5th, 1821, wrapped in his military cloak, whilst a tropical hurricane swept over the island and tore up by the roots some of the largest trees, "as if the spirit of the storms, borne on the wings of the wind, was hastening to inform the world that a mighty spirit had just descended into the dark abysses of nature."

The long martyrdom of Napoleon at St. Helena exalted him yet more, giving to him the only consecration which he had lacked, that of misfortune. This rock became a shrine where the hero was a demigod. His name became immensely popular, even among the most distant nations. On learning of his death, Lord Holland cried in the midst of the English parliament: "The universe mourns a hero." He had himself foreseen the influence which, as a captive of kings, he would gain among the people. "If I die on the cross," said he, "and my son lives, he will achieve a great destiny."

Treaties of 1815.—In the wreck of the empire France barely escaped destruction. Neither the chamber nor the government knew how to defend Paris. Davout, the Minister of War, came to an understanding with Fouché, the spirit of intrigue personified. The hero of Auerstadt capitulated to Blücher despite a vigorous address by seventeen generals who were desirous of continuing the struggle and despite the ardour of troops who still wished to fight. He signed a convention by which the French army was to retire beyond the Loire without firing a shot. The allies took possession of Paris as of a conquered city. Blücher proposed to blow up the Bridge of Jena and overturn the column of the Grand Army. The intervention of the King of Prussia, however, saved these monuments. The museum of the Louvre was despoiled of the masterpieces which had been transported thither, and the French library and valuable collections were pillaged. But the whole of France was not enough for the 1,200,000 foreigners who had hastened to their quarry.

The Chamber of Deputies had thought they would have charge of the negotiations, but the allies closed their hall and restored Louis XVIII. to his throne. This second restoration cost France dear. First of all it was compelled to pay the allies 100 millions, then another war indemnity of 70 millions, and yet another 370 millions of special claims. This was not all; 150,000 foreign soldiers remained for three years on French soil, maintained and fed at French expense to act as the police of Europe in France. Finally, the Treaty of Paris took from France Philippeville, Marienbourg, the duchy of Bouillon, Saarlouis and the course

of the Saar, Landau, several communes of the country of Gex and Savoy, which the treaty of 1814 had left her; in all, 534,000 inhabitants. They were deprived of the right of keeping a garrison in the principality of Monaco, before the Var, and the fortifications of Huningen were to be destroyed for ever. This town had merited her fate by the heroic defence made by a garrison of 135 men on June 25th and on August 27th. Auxonne also held out until that date—fifty-five days after the second capitulation of Paris.

Thus, after twenty-five years of victories, the national territory found itself less extensive in certain directions than it had been a century before at the end of the reign of Louis XIV.; and during that century the other powers had all vastly increased their strength. Prussia had become, from a simple electorate, a great monarchy; Russia, at that time hardly born, was a colossus; England had acquired a hundred million subjects in India and had seized the empire of the ocean: France was thus not only enfeebled by her own losses, but also by the gains of her rivals.

Moreover, the treaties of 1815 had perfidiously exposed the frontiers of France; Philippeville, Marienbourg, and Bouillon covered the outlets of the Ardenne: Rocroy was all that was left to France on that side; Saarlouis covered the large gap between the Moselle and the Vosges; Landau prevented the circuit of these mountains and defended the approaches to Strasburg: all these roads were open. Huningen, laid low, could no longer threaten Basle with its cannon and block the bridge of that town on the Rhine; Savoy, delivered to Piedmont, removed France further from the Alps, her natural frontier. Bavaria, her old ally in Germany, was placed at her gates, in the palatinate, to become her enemy; Prussia was established in the valley of the Moselle to bar the way should she attempt to break through by way of Metz and Thionville; the kingdom of the Netherlands was created to bar France from the mouths of the Meuse and Scheldt; and the gift of the kingdom of Lombardy to Austria restored in the Italian peninsula the ascendancy of the house of Habsburg at the expense of France which was excluded from Italy. Finally, by the Treaty of the Holy Alliance, Europe, which Napoleon had wished to unite under his authority, was indeed united, but this union, which lasted for forty years, was directed against France.

Fortunately for France, she preserved those advantages which could not be taken from her: her splendid position between two

seas and in the true centre of Europe ; her wonderful unity, her national spirit, the memory of a hundred victories, a certain pledge of new triumphs, should they be necessary, and the principles of 1789 which are still the foundation of the political system of France. Thus, despite the defeats of France and despite their millions of soldiers, the continental powers always feared those who in 1815 had been so glorious in defeat.

SUMMARY OF THE PRINCIPAL EVENTS FROM 1815 TO 1871

I

THE RESTORATION

Royalist Reaction.—The royalists avenged themselves cruelly for their second exile. Marshal Ney, Generals Labédoyère, Faucher, Mouton-Duvernet, Chartrand, and Bonnaire were shot; others were condemned to death for contumacy. "Soldiers, straight at the heart!" cried the hero of Moskwa, in directing the firing party. Marshal Brune, Generals Ramel and Lagarde were assassinated and a sanguinary reaction broke out in the south against those suspected of regretting the imperial regime. Religious hatred was added to political hatred, and many Protestants perished. Finally a law of December 4, 1815, instituted *provosts' courts* of three years' duration which came to merit a sinister renown. And so the restored monarchy had its massacres and its Terror, which was called the White Terror; Tresaillon was its hero.

The *introuvables* who composed the Chamber of Deputies had undertaken to suppress the Charter of Liberties and to undo the social work of the Revolution in giving again to the clergy and the aristocracy the political freedom they had enjoyed in the ancient regime. Louis XVIII. was obliged to dispense with some of his too devoted servitors (November 5, 1816) and a new and more moderate chamber commenced the era of representative government in France. This chamber adopted an electoral law which fixed the *cens* [1] of the electors at 300 francs, that of the eligibles at 1000 francs, with one electoral college in each department. It also decreed the military law of Marshal Gouvion St. Cyr, which ensured the recruiting of the army by conscription limited to six years' service, reserving a third of the grades to non-commissioned officers.

Thanks to the Duke of Richelieu and the generosity of the czar the occupation of French territory by the foreign armies

[1] An annual tax formerly paid to a lord of the manor.

ceased two years earlier than the time fixed by the treaties. The chambers recognised this service of the Duke of Richelieu, inscribing him, by way of national recompense, in the *Grand Livre* for a yearly income of 50,000 francs. He was poor, but he refused this reward in order not to aggravate the already overburdened charges on the country; such noble disinterestedness has not always been imitated.

Assassination of the Duke of Berri.—Until 1819 the progress of the liberal party was slow but continuous; it was already in the majority in the chamber as in the country, till the king, alarmed by the election of the Abbé Gregoire, an old constitutional bishop, thought he had gone too far in that direction and attached himself to the opposite party. This *système de bascule*, the balance system, as it was called, did not please either party. The assassination of the Duke of Berri destroyed the equilibrium to the advantage of the royalists. On the 13th February, 1820, the duke was at the opera: at ten o'clock, as he was conducting the duchess to her carriage, a miserable creature called Louvel stabbed him. The assassin insisted even on the scaffold that he had no accomplices. But liberal ideas were generally held responsible for the crime, and the new ministry which was then formed launched the government on that fatal path on which it came to grief in 1830.

Alliance between the Altar and the Throne.—Individual liberty was suspended, the censorship of the press re-established, and the double vote instituted in order that political influence should pass into the hands of the great proprietors who voted both at the college of the department and the college of the district. The birth of the Duke of Bordeaux, the posthumous son of the Duke of Berri (September 29, 1820), and the death of Napoleon (May 5, 1821) added to the joy and to the hopes of the ultra-royalists, who achieved the inclusion of MM. de Villèle and Corbière in the ministry. The restoration of the ancient prerogatives of the Church and the monarchy was now openly spoken of. The Jesuits, who had returned to France, charged themselves with converting the country to these ideas of a regime which had disappeared. They aimed a blow at their most important adversary, the University, in causing the lectures of M. Cousin and M. Guizot to be suppressed (1822), and in order to intimidate the press the *procès de tendance* was instituted, whereby accusation did not follow special faults, but was aimed rather at the general tendency given by the editor to his paper.

Secret Societies.—The liberals protested, after the manner of the suppressed, by conspiracies. At the *congrégation*, formed by the ultra-royalists under the direction of the Jesuits and which numbered 50,000 members, they opposed the *Charbonnerie* which was recruited chiefly from the schools, the bar, and the army. Carbonarisme extended its ramifications all over France, Germany, Italy, and Spain. It attempted several insurrections in the main army. In 1820 Captain Nantil (who later became General Berton), Colonel Caron, Captain Vallé, and four non-commissioned officers of La Rochelle were condemned and executed, all except Nantil, who escaped.

Expedition into Spain.—The conquerors of 1814 and 1815, Austria, Russia, and Prussia, had formed a *Holy Alliance* to extinguish, for their own benefit, the ideas of liberty which the Revolution had launched on the world and which fermented all over Europe. These ideas were violently repressed in Germany, at Naples, and in Piedmont, and the French government, which tried to prevent their recrudescence by laws and penalties, was ordered by the Congress of Verona (1822) to fight them in Spain. Chateaubriant, at that time Minister for Foreign Affairs, hoped that a successful expedition might give the Bourbons some military prestige. The army which entered Spain on April 7, 1823, found little opportunity for fighting, and met with serious resistance only at Cadiz, which it besieged. On August 31, French troops seized the strong position of Trocadero, which determined the surrender of that town. This expedition, without glory, was also without profit. Re-established by the arms of France in his position of absolute power, the King of Spain would not listen to the counsels of moderation which France gave him, and the French liberals held their government responsible for the outrages committed by Ferdinand VII. The ministry and the *congrégation*, on the contrary, deceived by this easy success, fell into a fatal confidence, which the elections increased, for they admitted only nineteen liberal deputies to the chamber.

Courier, Béranger.—But behind them and with them was the majority of the country who applauded the arrests of the magistracy which had become liberal since the *congrégation* had become threatening. The people read the pamphlets of Paul Louis Courier and the songs of Béranger with avidity. Béranger continued, even in prison, to attack this dangerous union of the throne and the altar, and he raised up against the kings, established by foreign influence, the glorious memories of

the empire. When he died, in 1857, the Emperor Napoleon III. paid the expenses of the funeral of this popular poet who had preserved and extended the worship of the first Napoleon.

Charles X.: M. de Villèle.—The death of Louis XVIII., a prudent and moderate king, seemed to assure the triumph of the ultra-royalists in giving the power to the Count of Artois (September 16, 1824). In 1789 this prince had given the signal for emigration; he had learnt nothing, forgotten nothing, and had not listened to his brother (Louis XVIII.) who on his death-bed had said to him, putting his hand on the head of the Duke of Bordeaux: "Charles X. must take care of this child's crown." He thought himself called to revive the ancient monarchy. "In France," he said, "the king consults the chambers; he gives deep consideration to their advice and remonstrances; but when the king is not convinced that they are right, his will must be carried out." These words were already the denial of the Charter of Liberties, and it caused no astonishment that he ended in violating it. From the first days of his reign, he demanded from the chambers, through M. de Villèle, an indemnity of one milliard for the emigrants, the re-establishment of convents for women, of the birthright, and a law of extreme severity against faults committed in the churches (the law of sacrilege). The deputies conceded all his demands; there was no resistance save in the Chamber of Peers, which by this opposition gained some days of public favour.

The ancient ceremony of consecration was revived in May, 1825, in honour of the king. Popular sentiment responded to this royal festival. One of the leaders of the liberal party, General Foy, had just died; 20,000 people followed his funeral procession and a national subscription assured the future of his children.

Liberal opinion gained ground every day. Literature and art were marked by a great revival, and this movement was towards liberty because it went against the traditions and the discipline of the schools. Men of authority or talent in parliament, Chateaubriant, Royer-Collard, De Broglie, Pasquier, De Barante, etc., worked in the interests of public liberty; the serious journals, the *Globe*, the *Censeur*, the *Débats*, the *Constitutionnel*, and the *Courrier Français* which now constituted a new power in the state—that of the press—openly defended public liberty; the more advanced teaching popularised it in the schools; the *Académie Française* itself protested against a proposed law which would have suppressed all liberty in periodical literature. The

great towns were in the opposition; Paris most of all. At review of the National Guard which the king inspected in Apr 1827, the cry, "Down with the ministers!" was heard from a ranks. That same evening the National Guard was disbanded, was a necessary measure after that protestation under arms, b it led to the estrangement of the bourgeoisie and the court. T ministry of Villèle survived for eight months longer. In ord to overcome the opposition of the Upper Chamber, he made batch of seventy-six peers; but the general election which imprudently provoked sent a liberal majority to the chamb under which he fell from power (December, 1827). Roye Collard was elected by seven colleges.

Battle of Navarino: Expedition of Morea.—All parties mar fested their sympathy with the Greeks who sought by the heroism to recover their independence. Byron, the great Engli poet, went to devote his life to their cause. They were about succumb in their unequal struggle against the Turks wh England, France, and Russia united to save them (July 5, 182 The three allied fleets destroyed the Turkish navy at Navari (September 20, 1827). France sent a force under General Mais to Morea and all the towns taken by the Turks were so recovered. Greece was delivered.

Moderation of M. de Martignac.—A new cabinet was form on January 4, 1828. It was known by the name of its mo influential minister, M. de Martignac. His intentions we both honest and liberal and his acts were generally approve He abolished the censorship of the press, tried to prevent ele toral frauds, placed those educational establishments direct by ecclesiastics under the common law, and reconciled Fran little by little to the Bourbons. But unfortunately Charles was given over to the counsels of the *congrégation;* he support his minister without liking him. After eighteen months, found his patience at an end, and on the 8th of August, 182 profiting by a check imprudently inflicted by the chamber these ministers, he replaced them by MM. de Polignac, Labourdonnaie, and Bourmont.

The Polignac Ministry.—This choice was a declaration war from the monarchy to the country; a crisis was inevitab For ten months the press of the opposition warned the gover ment that it would be compelled to come to an end by a stro of great policy and the deputies declared in their reply to t king's speech that the ministry had not their confidence. T chamber was dissolved, but the 208 signatories to the addr

were re-elected, and the monarchy, defeated in the elections, decided to have an 18th Brumaire, that is to say, a revolution.

The Capture of Algiers.—It was encouraged by a military success, the expedition of Algiers, undertaken to avenge an affront offered to the French consul. An army of 37,000 men, commanded by the Count of Bourmont, embarked at Toulon and landed on the African coast on June 13, 1830. The Algerians were beaten and dispersed among the mountains, the town was attacked, and on July 4 the French troops seized the fort called the Château de l'Empereur, which, dominating Algiers, assured the position to the French. The treasure amassed by the Dey (head of the government of Tunis) paid the costs of this expedition which planted the French flag on African soil, whence it has never been removed.

The Revolution of 1830.—On the 26th of July, the ordinances appeared which suppressed the liberty of the press, annulled the last elections, and created a new electoral system. It was a stroke of policy against public liberty and against the charter which had been the condition of the return of the Bourbons to the throne of their fathers. The magistracy declared the ordinances illegal (judgment of the Tribunal of the First Instance) and Paris replied to this provocation of the court by the three days of the 27th, 28th, and 29th July, 1830. It was legitimate resistance this time, for the bourgeoisie and the people fought against those who had violated the constitution. In spite of the bravery of the Royal Guard and of the Swiss soldiers, Charles X. was defeated. When he abdicated in favour of his grandson, the Duke of Bordeaux, he was greeted by a saying of the revolutions, "It is too late": he had to follow the road to exile. Six thousand victims had fallen, killed or wounded. On the 9th of August, the Chamber of Deputies raised the Duke of Orleans, the head of the younger branch of the Bourbons, to the throne. He took the name of Louis-Philippe I.

France welcomed this separation from the men of 1815 with practically unanimous acclamation. In taking again the flag of 1789, she seemed to have taken possession of herself and of her liberties.

II

THE GOVERNMENT OF JULY (AUGUST 9, 1830, TO FEBRUARY 24, 1848)

Louis-Philippe.—In showing the Duke of Orleans to the peop at the Hôtel de Ville, La Fayette had said: "Here is the be republic!" Many people shared his opinion. The priva virtues of this prince, his good family, his ancient relations wi the leaders of the liberal party, the carefully revived memori of Jemappes and Valmy, his bourgeois habits, the popul education given to his son in the public schools—all these led high hopes for the success of his reign.

The Duke of Orleans, head of the younger branch of t house of Bourbon, was proclaimed king on the 9th of Augu after having taken his oath to observe the revised Charter Liberties. The changes made at that time on the constitution agreement, or in the following months on the existing laws, we of little importance. They comprised the abolition of heredi of the peerage; the abolition of the censorship of the pres the fixing of the tax for eligibility at 500 francs, and the electo tax at 200 francs, which ensured property the possession political rights and did not reserve them specially for intelligenc the suppression of the article which recognised the Catho religion as the religion of the state; the suppression of peerages created by Charles X. But in 1814 Louis XVIII. h seemed to *concede* to a charter by his good pleasure; in 18 Louis-Philippe accepted a charter which was *imposed* on hi by the deputies. This fact contained all the revolution. It mu however, be averred that the law, violated at first by t monarchy, was subsequently violated by the chamber, seei that the deputies disposed of the crown and remodelled t constitution without appealing to the country.

Ministry of M. Laffite (1830–1831).—The commotion caus by the fall of the restoration had given an unexpected force the republican party. It was necessary therefore to take it in consideration. It was sometimes flattered in the persons of t men whom the republicans respected, General la Fayette, w had been made commander of all the National Guards of Franc and M. Laffite, who was called to the ministry. The popular of the first was easily exploited after the lawsuit of the ministe

of Charles X.; that of the second up to the moment when he had to give definite pronouncements on external policy.

France had the distinguished honour of fixing on herself the attention of the world. The commotion of the downfall of the throne at Paris on July 29, 1830, had alarmed all crowned heads and compromised all unpopular powers. In Switzerland the government of the aristocracy fell; in Germany liberal innovations were introduced. Italy was quaking, Spain was on the brink of a revolution; Belgium separated herself from Holland; England, moved and agitated, extorted from the Tories the Reform Bill. Peace had been more profitable than this war of liberty. Ideas repaired the conquest lost by arms.

But was it necessary for France to constitute herself the champion of all the insurrections of Europe at the risk of causing a universal war, of causing rivers of blood to flow? The new king did not think so. Belgium, having separated herself from Holland, now offered herself to France; she was repulsed in order not to excite the jealousy of England. The Spanish refugees wished to attempt a revolution in their own country; they were stopped on the frontier in order not to violate international law, even in the face of a prince who was a secret enemy.

Poland, delivered for a short time by heroic efforts, appealed to France. Was it possible to save her by arms? As she said herself at the time of her greatest misfortunes, "God is too high above: France is too far away." Only isolated relief was sent to her; it did not prevent the fall of Warsaw. That fall re-echoed sorrowfully in the heart of France.

Italy, in the toils of Austria, tried to break her chains. M. Laffite wished to help her. The king refused to follow him so far, and called Casimir-Perrier to the presidency of the council.

Ministry of Casimir-Perrier (1831–1832).—This policy was thought to be over-prudent. Casimir-Perrier lent it one moment of greatness by the energy which he put at the service of this moderation. He declared two things clearly: that he wanted law and order; that in consequence he would fight the republicans and the legitimists to the death; that he would not lead France in a universal war; for that reason he would make all sacrifices compatible with the honour of the country, for the sake of the peace of the world. These words sounded audacious; his acts bore them out.

The Occupation of Ancona.—Don Miguel had treated two Frenchmen outrageously in Portugal. A fleet forced the rapids

of the Tagus, reputed impassable, and cast anchor 300 fathom from the quays of Lisbon. The Portuguese ministers humiliate themselves: a legitimate reparation was accorded. The Dutc had invaded Belgium; 50,000 French soldiers marched int Belgium and the Dutch flag retreated. The Austrians who ha once already retired from the papal states, returned to them Casimir-Perrier, resolved to make the principle of non-interven tion respected, sent a flotilla to the Adriatic, and the troop who were disembarked seized Ancona. The sudden appearanc of the tricolour in the centre of Italy was almost a declaratio of war to Austria. She did not accept it and withdrew he troops.

Insurrection at Lyons: Plots at Paris.—The President c Council followed the same line of conduct which he had marke out for himself in the interior. The legitimists agitated th western departments; mobile columns quelled the revolt. Th workers of Lyons, roused by cruel miseries and also by the leaders, had risen. They inscribed on their banner these sorrow ful and sinister words: "Live working or die fighting." After terrible battle in the streets they were disarmed and orde seemed on the surface to be re-established. Grenoble in it turn was stained with blood. At Paris the plots of "the towe of Notre-Dame" and of the "rue des Prouvaires" we discovered.

Such was the ministry of Casimir-Perrier; an energetic warfa in which his strong will never gave way, in the cause of orde before any obstacle. Colleagues, the chamber, the king himse —he mastered them all. But such a life had exhausted his force and when cholera came to the town in 1832 it carried him o on May 16.

Ministry of October 11, 1832: MM. de Broglie, Guizot, ar Thiers: Insurrection of 5th and 6th June at Paris.—Society wa troubled in its most intimate depths by the partisans of S Simon and De Fourier who demanded a new social order. The men now only played the rôle of apostles of peace; the insu rection of Lyons had shown in the proletariats an army read to apply their doctrines. The National Guard defended th monarchy energetically until after the funeral ceremonies General Lamarque; the republicans engaged in the battle the 5th and 6th of June behind the barricades of St. Méry. Th check broke down their party for some time. A month later th death of Napoleon's son, the Duke of Reichstadt, disembarrasse the Orleans dynasty from a redoubtable rival. At the sam

time the house of Orleans seemed to gain support in the marriage of the Princess Louise to the King of the Belgians.

Arrest of the Duchess of Berri.—Another pretender also lost her cause. The Duchess of Berri, secretly disembarked on the coast of Provence with the title of regent, had come in the name of her son Henry V. to set a match to a civil war in the west. But the soldiers of this war were only Vendeans and *Chouans*. The new ideas had penetrated there as elsewhere, perhaps more than elsewhere. "These people are patriots and republicans!" said an officer ordered to fight them. Some gentlemen, a few refractories, and fewer peasants responded to the appeal. The country, covered with troops, was soon pacified, and the duchess, having for many weeks wandered from farm to farm, entered Nantes disguised as a peasant woman. This rash adventuress showed the weakness of the legitimist party. In order to compass its ruin, M. Thiers, minister at that time, caused an active search to be made for the duchess. Discovered on November 7th and imprisoned at Blaye, she was forced to avow a secret marriage which rendered any subsequent attempts on account of her son impossible.

Success Abroad.—The capture by French soldiers of the citadel of Antwerp, which the Dutch had refused to give up to the Belgians, put an end to a critical situation which at any moment might have developed into war (December 23, 1832). The occupation of Arzew, Mostaganem, and Bougie firmly established the French hold on Algiers, and the expeditions on the banks of the Scheldt and the shores of the Mediterranean shed glory on her arms.

In the East French diplomacy intervened between the sultan and his victorious vassal, the Pasha of Egypt. The Treaty of Kutayeh, which left Syria to Méhémet-Ali, did not make the Sultan weaker than he had been before, but it fortified the viceroy of Egypt, the guardian for France and for Europe of those two great commercial routes by the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf which England longed to possess.

In Portugal Don Miguel, an absolutist prince, was overthrown in favour of Donna Maria, who gave her people a constitutional charter. In Spain Ferdinand VII. died, excluding his brother Don Carlos, who supported the retrogressive party, from the throne by the Salic Law, with the result that the whole peninsula escaped at the same time from absolutism.

The Quadruple Alliance.—The Treaty of the Quadruple Alliance, signed on April 22, 1834, between the courts of Paris,

London, Lisbon, and Madrid, promised the new Spanish a Portuguese governments the efficacious support of these constit tional countries against the evil intentions of the northern cour

These promises were followed by natural consequences France. In order to sustain—should need arise—the you Queen Isabella against the Spanish legitimists, the natural alli of the French legitimists, an army corps of 50,000 men w formed at the foot of the Pyrenees.

In the interior the chambers had adopted a law which at la organised primary education in France (1833). In parliame the majority on all serious questions had been secured by t ministry. If the jury often acquitted political offenders, t army was faithful, and the magistracy showed a severity again the republicans which reassured the court.

A first attempt on the life of the king caused the monarchy profit by the horror always inspired by such crimes. "We well!" said the king, "they have aimed at me." "Sire replied Dupin, "they have aimed at themselves."

The insurrections of April, 1834, at Lyons and at Paris, a the dramatic incidents of legal proceedings begun against r republicans before the house of peers, led to the imprisonment the flight of almost all the republican leaders and the momenta ruin of that party as a militant faction.

Attempt on the Life of the King.—But the violent membe of the party turned again to thoughts of assassination. At review on July 28, 1835, a man called Fieschi, who had alrea been arrested for a criminal offence and for forgery, direct an infernal machine against the king. It spread death arou the monarch, killing Marshal Mortier, one of the glories of t empire and but lately president of council; one general, t colonels, one old man, two women, one young girl, and many the National Guard; in all eighteen persons were killed a twenty-two wounded, of whom five were generals. This dread occurrence alarmed society, still nervous from the effects of t recent civil war and the violent turns of fortune occasioned the lawsuits of April. The ministry made use of the univers indignation to introduce the laws of September to the Cou of Assize, the jury, and the press. They were calculated to ren criminal justice more severe and more prompt; they forba all discussion on the principles of government and raised t cautions of the newspapers from 48,000 to 100,000 francs.

External Policy.—Up to this time the cause of order had be energetically pursued in the interior; now that it was triumpha

M. Thiers, president of the council of ministers since February 22, 1836, wished to take up the rôle of Casimir-Perrier abroad.

The Spanish Carlists were making alarming progress in the peninsula; M. Thiers decided to intervene; England herself demanded that he should. Thus his action was at the same time a means of bringing France and England nearer together, and of defending the ideas of liberty in Europe with a high hand. The recollection of the unfortunate intervention of 1823 was thus gloriously effaced.

The same ministry had conceived and prepared another expedition. Since the conquest of Algiers, France had made little progress in the ancient regency. Some towns had been taken on the coast, and a few battles had been fought in the interior. M. Thiers charged Marshal Clausel to attack Constantine, the strongest place in the whole of Africa, at the same time he counted on General Bugeaud entering Spain at the head of 12,000 men. Thus the government which had put down the troubles in the interior were about to open up abroad an outlet for the activities of France. She wished to add glory to the order she had achieved. The king, who was alarmed at all great movements, gave his consent to the expedition against Constantine, because shots fired in Africa, he said, would not be heard in Europe; but he refused his consent to the proposed intervention in Spain. Rather than give in, M. Thiers left the ministry, where M. Molé replaced him as president of council (September 6, 1836).

Ministry of Molé (1836–1839).—The first part of the ministry of M. Molé was marked by unfortunate events. Marshal Clausel failed in the expedition against Constantine for want of sufficient forces. Prince Louis, a nephew of Napoleon, attempted to cause an insurrection in the garrison of Strasburg (October 30, 1836). He was arrested and conducted out of the kingdom, but his accomplices were tried before a jury; they were released and acquitted because their leader had escaped. This verdict did not satisfy the court, and the ministry presented the *law of separation* which violated the principle of equality before justice, in submitting to two different jurisdictions the citizens and the military accused of the same crimes. The chamber refused this measure.

These checks were made good in the following years by successes. The Treaty of Tafna, of which the imprudence was not realised till later, pacified the province of Oran. At the other extremity of the Algerian possessions, the army finally planted its flag on the walls of Constantine (1837), and to terminate the

long series of quarrels with Mexico, an expedition was sent ther which seized St. John Ulloa, and thus gave France Vera Cru and the principal customs house of the country. Mexico pai an indemnity of war. The Prince of Joinville was now servin with the fleet; he showed the same courage which his brother had many times displayed in Africa at the head of the Frenc army. The birth of a son to the Duke of Orleans (August 24 1838), called by the king Count of Paris, seemed to secure th dynasty.

Parliamentary Coalition (1838).—But already violent attack on the ministers were preparing in parliament. M. Mol had, according to the terms of the treaty of 1832, recalled th French troops from Ancona; the Austrians claimed to hav defeated the tricolour at Ancona, in order to lower the prestig of France in Europe and to cause her to renounce a valuabl pawn which she held against Austria. French diplomacy di not seem happier in its management of Dutch-Belgian affairs The revolution of Brussels sought to separate two peoples divided by language, by religion, and by interests. But th treaty of twenty-four articles accepted by the French ministry ceded to the King of Holland the Belgian population which ha fought against him. Europe had not wished to allow the provinc of Luxemburg to fall into the friendly hands of France; tha province would have covered one of the most vulnerable point on her frontiers.

With more regard for national honour, it was said, with mor confidence in the strength of the country, these useless concession to the system of peace at any price might have been spared. Bu the real pretext of these attacks was what was called the insuffi ciency of the ministry. A coalition was formed to recall th device of 1830: "The king reigns but does not govern." Thi coalition was composed of M. Guizot, the leader of the *doc trinaires*, the least numerous party, but one full of talen and ambition; M. Thiers, leader of the Left Centre, wher personal government was hotly condemned; M. Odilon Barrot leader of the deputies opposed to the policy but devoted to th person of the king.

The ministry wished to retire on January 22, 1839. The king who was ignorant of the real situation, refused the resignation and made an appeal to the country in pronouncing the dissolu tion of the chamber. The ministry threw itself energetically into the electoral campaign; it was defeated and fell. Rivalr broke out when the portfolios were distributed; the coalitio

broke up on the day following its triumph. Inextricable difficulties in the way of forming a new ministry held Paris for a whole month in suspense. The occasion seemed favourable to those republicans who still believed more in the efficacy of musket-shots than in the propaganda of ideas. Their leaders, Barbès and Blanqui, born conspirators of gloomy disposition, attempted a revolution. They did not even achieve an insurrection (May 12).

Ministry of Marshal Soult.—This reawakening of violent passions precipitated a ministerial crisis. On the same day a cabinet was constituted under the presidency of Marshal Soult. None of the leaders of the coalition took part in it. It could be nothing but an interim ministry; it lasted only for ten months, from May 12, 1839, till March 1, 1840.

Iron Gates or Biban's Pass: Mazagran.—Under this government, Abd-el-Kader in Africa broke the Treaty of Tafna and proclaimed a holy war; success attended the efforts of this rising. Marshal Valée and the Duke of Orleans crossed the dangerous pass of the Iron Gates or Biban's Pass and two months later the regular infantry of the emir was utterly crushed at the Battle of the Chiffa. A success which moved the country more was the heroic resistance offered for forty days by 120 men who opposed thousands of Arabs in the fort of Mazagran.

The Question of the East.—The chief question dealt with by this cabinet was that of the East. The sultan had wished to take back Syria from the Pasha of Egypt, and Ibrahim Pasha, the son of Méhémet-Ali, assisted by many French officers who had long since passed into his service, had conquered the Turks in the fighting at Nezib. This victory opened to him the way to Constantinople. But if he marched on that town, the Russians would enter it on pretext of defending it; once within its walls, they might never leave it. France by her intervention stopped this victorious Ibrahim.

Constantinople was saved, but Alexander of Russia was compromised. England, sure that for a time the Russians would not come to the Dardanelles, wished to prevent a return of these fears which she had entertained for a moment. The most certain way of securing this seemed to her to deprive Méhémet-Ali of Syria. England would be doubly repaid by this move; the Ottoman Empire would be strengthened and Egypt would be weakened. France had identical interests with Great Britain at Constantinople; in Egypt the two interests appeared to be contrary. But in protecting Constantinople, the

ministry had made no stipulations in favour of Méhémet-Al
it accepted for the settlement of this affair a European congres
at which it could count beforehand on four votes in its favo
and five against.

Ministry of the 1st of March.—This mistake weighed heavi
on the following ministry, that of March 1, 1840, which w
constituted under the presidency of M. Thiers, when Marsh
Soult and his colleagues were overthrown by a vote they ha
provoked on the principle of endowment.

Ten years of peace and material well-being had develope
new needs. As at the end of the Restoration, the country w
prosperous ; but as at that period also, it was in a state of unre
and fermentation.

The ministry tried to achieve popularity by one of those ac
which weaken respect for the law and for the magistracy, witho
disarming parties or diminishing passions : it promulgated a
ordinance for amnesty which completed that brought forwa
in May 8, 1837. It was to give the leaders over to the repu
licans. At the same time the government augmented the forc
of the new party which was forming itself round the represent
tive of the dynasty of Napoleon. It satisfied one of the mo
noble vows of the country, which was indignant that the mort
remains of the emperor should rest forgotten and witho
honour in the hands of those who had caused his death ; t
ministry obtained the restitution of these glorious remains fro
England. The Prince of Joinville, sent to St. Helena to bri
back the body of the emperor, acquitted himself nobly of th
mission. On the return journey an English attack was fear
and he made his attendants swear that they would blow up the
precious burden rather than surrender it.

Treaty of London.—But grave events were preparing in t
East. France liked the conqueror of Nezib, this Ibrahim w
was never tired of listening in his tent to stories of the victori
of France, and France liked Méhémet-Ali, the old Pasha
Egypt, that barbarian of genius who bridled the ambitions
England, who gave France in sympathy for her customs a
her power that which France gave him in esteem. Europe, a
above all England, resolved to break this bond of sympath
which put Toulon, Algiers, Alexandria, Beyrouth, and the flee
of France, Egypt, and Turkey under the same hand and assur
France the preponderance in the Mediterranean. On July
England, Russia, and the two powers which they dragged alo
with them signed, without the participation of France, t

Treaty of London, which was to deprive the Pasha of Egypt of Syria.

And so France was banished from Europe; the coalition against her was renewed. All the sacrifices made for the peace of the world, all the advances made to absolutist monarchs had been useless. At this news a wave of anger swept over the whole country; the government seemed to associate itself with this legitimate explosion of national sentiment, and France put her hand to the hilt of her sword . . . but she did not draw it. The French fleet in the Levant, which—as the English themselves allowed—could have annihilated the British fleet, returned to Toulon, and the bombardment of Beyrouth, the fall of Egyptian power in Syria, was an affront to France and a check to her policy.

Should she fight?—No. She was alone at that time against the world, and the courts would have known well how to turn the peoples against her, in putting before their eyes the phantom of French ambition, in reviving the hateful memories of 1813. Already Germany was crying with all its might: "No, you shall not have our German Rhine!"

While not accepting war under the disadvantageous conditions which existed, the ministry wanted at least to give France a firm and dignified position. It ordered the fortification of Paris to act as a shield for the heart of France; it armed the strongholds, it enlarged the army, and as the powers had isolated France, the ministry accepted this isolation which gave her liberty of movement and the facility of choosing her alliances with kings or peoples at her own time and in her own way.

This situation had its dangers. The king was alarmed. He abandoned the ministry he had followed up till now; M. Thiers gave way to M. Guizot (October 29, 1840).

Ministry of the 29th of October.—M. Guizot did not lay much weight on public opinion or on national sentiment. He hastened to stretch out a friendly hand to England and those other powers which had wounded France to the quick. On July 13, 1841, he signed the treaty of *detroits*, which caused the return of France to what was called the Concert of European powers, that is to say, France was admitted to that pentarchy of five great powers which the treaties of 1815 had constituted under the name of the Holy Alliance.

This was equivalent to a treaty of peace. The army was demobilised and reduced and France, which had all but entered on war, was thrown back into the peaceful paths of commerce

and industry by the vote of a legal process connected with th railways. The activity of commercial transactions showed wit what confidence the merchants regarded the duration of th ministry which in some sort was the personification of peac

Death of the Duke of Orleans.—On July 13, 1842, an unfortu ate occurrence threw the whole country without distinction party into mourning. The Duke of Orleans, an agreeable ar justly loved prince, fell from his carriage and was killed. H rights passed to his son, the Count of Paris; a child of fo years old was heir to the most weighty crown he could ha had to support. From that day hope sprang up once more amor the legitimists; the liberals and the republicans hoped for th triumph of their ideas during the weakness of a regency.

The Regency.—The chambers were soon convoked. Th were presented with a law which named the Duke of Nemou in advance as the regent for his nephew. This prince had neith the brilliant reputation of the Duke of Orleans nor the popular which had been already accorded to the Prince of Joinville f his services before St. John Ulloa, nor the reputation whi the Duke of Aumale had won by the carrying off of the *sma* of Abd-el-Kader. The law passed, but without obtaining th general assent of the public.

The Affair of Tahiti.—National sentiment was profound wounded by the events of 1840. M. Guizot sought a compens tion to restore national pride. He caused the Marquesas, barr rocky islands in the Pacific Ocean, to be occupied (May, 184 New Zealand would have been better; France was about to i vade it when England, forewarned, took possession and began show jealous susceptibilities. A French officer planted the Fren flag on the large oceanic island of New Caledonia. The stat of the Honduras and Nicaragua reclaimed the protectorate France, Haïti did the same; it was refused, and England seems have imposed this refusal. In the Society Islands, which Fran also took, the commercial interests she had in these seas we unfortunately not large enough to require a costly establis ment. The acquisition of Mayotte (1843) was a better piece business, because that island offered French ships a refuge a a naval station in the vicinity of Madagascar. In the Socie Islands, at Tahiti, an English missionary, Pritchard, excit the natives against the French. The indignant agent of t London mission was driven from the island (1844), but l outcry resounded in the English parliament and the Fren cabinet committed the fault of asking the chambers to give

indemnity to the man who had caused the blood of her soldiers to flow. The denial of Rear-Admiral Dupetit-Thouars, who had tried to give more serious proportions to the French establishment in Oceania, increased public irritation; a new proof of the weakness of France against England was demonstrated.

The Right of Visit.—A more serious concession was made to our jealous neighbours in the Right of Visit allowed to England in 1841 for the repression of trade. But this time the opposition of the country was so acute that the chamber forced the ministry to destroy the treaty and by a new agreement to place the mercantile marine of France under the exclusive protection of the national flag (May, 1845).

Defeat of Abd-el-Kader.—The chamber, forced into this path by public opinion, had not wished to continue with the conquest of Algeria. The ministry had the merit of choosing an energetic and able man, General Bugeaud, who knew how to inspire at the same time the respect and the fear of the Arabs. Abd-el-Kader had violated the Treaty of Tafna, preached the Holy War, and by the rapidity of his movements spread consternation in the province of Oran, and inquietude even to the gates of Algiers. General Bugeaud followed him without delay into the mountains of Ouarensenis, pacified that difficult region, and threw the enemy back on the desert.

It was in this flight towards the Sahara that the emir, overtaken by the Duke of Aumale, lost his *smala* (his family and his troops, May, 1843).

Bombardment of Tangier and Mogador: Capture of Abd-el-Kader.—A refugee in Morocco, the emir enlisted the sympathies of the emperor. England was no stranger to this resolution. French territory was violated, some of her territory was taken, and an army which seemed formidable was mobilised on the banks of the Moulouiah. France replied to these provocations by the bombardment of Tangier and Mogador, carried out by the Prince of Joinville under the eyes of the English fleet; also by the victory of Isly, which General Bugeaud gained with 8500 men and 1400 horses over 25,000 horsemen (August 14, 1844). The emperor, thus rudely punished, signed a peace which France made easy for him because she was rich enough, as her ministry said, to pay for her glory. The principal article of the treaty was that Abd-el-Kader should be imprisoned in the west; t was for long unfulfilled; but after a new and futile attempt on Algeria the emir set to work to form a party in the empire tself. Abd-er-Rhaman, this time directly threatened, remem-

bered the treaty made between France and Abd-el-Kader; thrown back on the French outposts, he was reduced to give himself up to General Lamoricière (November 23, 1847).

Marriage of the Duke of Montpensier.—In Morocco, as at Tahiti, the French had found the English against them. And so the English alliance, too greedily sought after, was nothing but an embarrassment to France. But it assured, it was said, the peace of the world. A marriage failed to break it, that of the Duke of Montpensier with the sister of the Queen of Spain. The younger branch of the Bourbons was trying to restore the fortunes of the elder branch in the peninsula, and to deprive a Prince of Coburg, the English candidate, of his expectations of the crown of Spain—as if the times had not done away with nearly all the political importance of such princely unions. England showed profound displeasure at the haste with which this marriage had been contracted. As she drew away from France, the ministry, alarmed at the thought of the isolation to which France seemed about to return, approached Austria in spite of her suppression of the last remains of Poland, the state of Cracow; in order to gain Austria, France sacrificed Switzerland and Italy.

Switzerland wished to reform her constitution in such a way as to give more authority to central power. France had a serious interest in this change, because a strong Switzerland covered her frontiers better than a divided Switzerland. But it was the liberal party which was anxious for this reform. M. Guizot resisted it and favoured the *Sonderbund* (the separatists, 1847).

On the banks of the Po, the Austrians had occupied Ferrara; the pope, Pius IX., who was reawakening Italy from her torpor, protested but was ill-supported (1847). At Milan the Austrian garrison committed horrible atrocities (February, 1848). M. Guizot contented himself with negotiating in favour of the victims.

Thus France became allied with an empire which at that time supported itself by oppressing—the one by the other—the various peoples which it had enslaved.

Internal Policy.—For several years the country had enjoyed a remarkable prosperity which was attested by a budget showing receipts of 1500 millions. Popular education was developing; the penal code had been mitigated; lotteries had been suppressed; the law of judicial dispossession for the furtherance of works of utility permitted that works undertaken in the general interest should not be hindered by particular interests. Industry took a great leap forward by the introduction of machinery

and commerce expanded. The coasts were lit by lighthouses, the roads improved, and a vast network of railways decreed. But this plan once conceived, instead of concentrating all the forces of France on the great artery of the country, the railway from Boulogne to Marseilles, efforts were spread over all lines at once, with the intention of satisfying every locality and thus preparing for elections favourable to the government.

These enterprises, as often happens, gave rise to immoderate gambling and stockjobbing. The evil went to great lengths, for one of the king's ministers was condemned for having sold his signature, a peer of France for having bought it.

Political Banquets.—The elections of 1846, carefully prepared and conducted by the administration, gave it the majority. But the number of functionaries sent to the chamber was considerable. It became evident, that in the *legal* country, that is to say, in the small class formed by the electors, the political sense was disappearing, calculation was taking the place of patriotism: the electors sold their votes to the deputy; those elected sold their suffrage to the ministers; the representative regime was vitiated at its source. This occasioned the deceitful policy—fatal to everybody—of a minister repulsed by opinion but retained by an artificial majority. The President of Council, who thought himself in a strong position because he counted on a chamber composed after his own taste, dealt in a high-handed way with the parliamentary opposition, the only opposition with which he consented to occupy himself. He had said at the time of the elections: "Every policy promises progress; but conservative policy alone gives it." In the meantime he refused everything, under the pretext that nothing must be forced or hurried. The deputies of the Left Centre and of the Left dynasty, directed by M. Thiers and M. Odilon Barrot, demanded that the ministry should redeem its promises. They demanded the rearrangement of certain taxes; electoral and parliamentary reform, which had been vainly proposed at each session since 1842. The ministry repulsed these offensive claims and jeered at the opposition for its futile efforts to make the country shake off its political torpor. To this defiance, the opposition replied by seventy reunions or banquets in the most important towns. They spoke to the people of the grievances of the country; of the abasement of France abroad, a France which had no longer her necessary influence in Europe; a France which at home was refused the most legitimate reforms; they condemned what

they called the equivocal policy of the government, electoral and parliamentary corruption.

Resistance of the Ministry.—Paris, which from instinct and from tradition liked to criticise, since it had nothing to fear, went over entirely to the opposition. In recent municipal elections in the poor quarters of the town, and consequently the most essentially moderate quarters, not one ministerial candidate had been elected. A paper founded by the conservatives had not been able to survive. But even in the midst of the conservative party disaffection began to appear. Many influential members of the majority went over to the opposition. The Prince of Joinville showed marked disapprobation and exiled himself in Algiers, near his brother the Duke of Aumale. In the ministry itself some members repudiated this "no surrender" policy. M. de Salvandy, who at the department of public instruction had undertaken numerous and liberal reforms, was only induced to stay at his post by his desire to defend the proposed laws he had presented. But the chief minister caused the struggle to become acute in making the king announce at the opening of the session of 1848 a discourse which declared one hundred deputies to be the enemies of the throne.

Acrimonious debates kept public opinion in anxiety for six weeks. External events, the victory of the Swiss liberal party, the movements of Italy which attempted to escape from the restraint of Austria, reacted on France. The opposition tried a last manifestation, the banquet or reunion of the twelfth district. The republicans, who had long given way to discouragement, began to hope again; they allowed things to proceed, but they held themselves ready. "If the ministry," said one of their leaders of February 20, "authorise the banquet, the ministry will fall. If they forbid it, revolution will break out." The Left dynasty made a last effort to prevent an explosion: on the 21st, M. Odilon Barrot laid on the desk of the chamber an accusation against the ministry.

Revolution of February 24, 1848.—The ministry forbade the reunion, and at once immense crowds gathered; here and there conflicts ensued. But on the evening of February 23, the opposition had gained its cause; a liberal ministry was named under the presidency of M. Thiers. But those who had so well commenced the movement had prepared nothing to arrest it once it had obtained a majority in the country. Men of attack rather than of resistance, of criticism rather than of action, they saw in a few hours the direction of the movement

escape from them, to pass to a party of conspirators who had done some public service, or to veterans of the barricades, men of combat who threw themselves into the crowds by which the boulevards, brilliantly illuminated and full of gaiety, were filled. At a shot fired at the office for foreign affairs, the crowd replied by a volley which brought fifty innocent people to the ground. At the sight of their bodies being carried away into the town the cry, "They are assassinating our brothers! Vengeance!" was raised and the people of the faubourgs rushed to arms. The king could rely on his army, commanded by General Bugeaud. This energetic man had already laid his plans for repressing the rising, when on the night of the 23rd he was commanded by the new minister to withdraw his troops to the Tuileries. Rather than obey this foolish order he resigned his command; the resistance was paralysed. As for the National Guard, hastily assembled, and thinking that everything would be put right by a change of ministers, they let the reform pass, the revolution followed it. For some weeks they tried to destroy that which in this moment, without knowing it, they had helped to build up: but for them, too, it was too late: the 24th of February was the moral death of the institution born on July 14, 1789. Abandoned by the Parisian bourgeoisie, Louis-Philippe thought himself abandoned by the whole of France. At midday he abdicated, while fighting was still going on round the Royal Palace; he left Paris protected by several regiments, but he was not followed or molested in any way.

The Duke of Orleans, who had exercised great influence over the army, was dead; the Prince of Joinville and the Duke of Aumale, who enjoyed a popularity as just as it was great, were out of France. There were left only the Duke of Nemours, an unpopular prince, the Duke of Montpensier, who was still too young to be known, the Duchess of Orleans, and the Count of Paris. The duchess was respected for her virtues and her fine spirit, but she was a foreigner, isolated and without force. While the people entered the Tuileries, she went to the chamber, taking the young Count of Paris with her; the insurgents followed and proclaimed a provisory government composed of M. Dupont (de l'Eure), MM. Arago, Lamartine, Crémieux, Ledru-Rollin, and Garnier-Pagès.

And so, owing to the incapacity of the government and the audacity of one of the parties, France had, instead of a regularly accomplished reform, a new insurrection, which stopped all work, ruined thousands, caused rivers of blood to flow, and threw

the country out of the paths of pacific progress. Two men abov all others deserve the blame for this useless revolution, for the los of this dynasty : the one who could have prevented the rising i taking from the people their pretext ; the other who could hav stopped it but did not dare.

III

THE REPUBLIC OF 1848

Provisory Government. — On the evening of the 24th th provisory government proclaimed the republic. On the 26th a immense crowd which had gathered in front of the Hôtel d Ville demanded that the red flag should become the symbol o the new power. Lamartine energetically opposed this request " This flag appeared only at the Champ de Mars and was ther trailed through blood ; while the tricolour has flown all over th world proclaiming everywhere the name and the glory o France." He gained his point ; that victory was won b eloquence.

The provinces submitted as usual to the deeds accomplishe in the capital and seemed to accept the republic. A festival a the foot of the column of the Bastille celebrated the establish ment of the new power ; that festival was repeated in many o the chief towns of departments. What were known as *trees o liberty* were planted on public squares and blessed by the clergy M. Ledru-Rollin replaced the prefects by commissioners charge with administration in the terms of the new government ; an in order to reassure Europe, Lamartine declared in a manifest that the republic threatened nobody, but that it would resis every intervention to compromise the legitimate claims of th people. Arago declared the emancipation of the negroes in th French colonies.

Difficulties of the Situation.—Industry and commerce stopped the revenues of the state were lowered, the abolition of the sal tax and other unpopular taxes diminished it still further. Als the minister of finance was obliged, in order to face ordinar expenditure, to add to the four direct taxes an extraordinar tax of forty-five centimes ; it was a bad beginning for republican government.

Many manufactories were closed down, thousands of work people found themselves without bread, exposed to the fate o

becoming dupes of communist doctrines, which, after having deeply undermined society, had suddenly exploded. The provisory government had the imprudence to declare that it would guarantee the *existence of the workman by his work*, that is to say, that it would provide work when there was neither work to do nor money to pay; the government authorised one of its members, M. Louis Blanc, to open at the Luxemburg, with the delegates of the working classes, deliberations on the subject, so delicate and at that time so little understood; to establish points of union between the work which produced and the capital which put it in action. Finally in order to occupy the workmen national *ateliers* were set up where dangerous idleness and discouraged honesty met together. Every speech of M. Louis Blanc at the Luxemburg sent more recruits to that army of organised disorder in Paris itself of which the clubs and the newspapers fanned the flame.

Demonstrations of 16th and 17th March.—This antagonism of interests and ideas led to another struggle. On March 16th chosen companies and the former National Guard made a demonstration at the Hôtel de Ville to deploy those forces mustered by the bourgeoisie. The next day, in revenge, the corporations of workmen, the delegates of the Luxemburg, the national *ateliers*, agitated by their leaders who would have liked to push them still further, made a counter-demonstration in favour of the proletariat. The provisory government, of which the members, in spite of internal rivalries, stood firm together, were obliged every day to make speeches and proclamations, which gave Lamartine a growing but ephemeral popularity. In order not to leave the capital defenceless and at the mercy of factions, the provisory government caused some battalions of the army which had left it humiliated to return to Paris on February 23. The youngest and most ardent of these were formed into a body devoted to the republic under the name of the *Garde mobile*.

Opening of the National Assembly: the Executive Commission.—After a fresh socialistic demonstration which overpowered the National Guard (April 16) and a festival of fraternity (April 21) which reconciled nobody, the electoral colleges met on Sunday, April 23. The elections were made for the first time by manhood suffrage. That measure was passed by nine million votes to 220,000; a sudden displacement of political life for which nothing had been prepared, and which must inevitably lead to catastrophes. The name of Lamartine, elected by six departments, characterised this period of the revolution. On May 4th

the Constitutional Assembly met, solemnly proclaimed the republic, and in spite of the memories of the weakness of the Directory, imprudently confided the power to an executive commission composed of five members, MM. Arago, Garnier-Pagès, Marie, Lamartine, and Ledru-Rollin.

It appeared as if nothing was needed but to make the Constitution. Unfortunately the revolution was differently interpreted every day. Some said it was exclusively political and pretended to confine it to modifications in the form of government; others wished it to be a social revolution, and looked to it to transform society. Many even spoke already of a return to the monarchy and some saw again the ruin of public authority.

The 25th May.—An attack on the National Assembly was the first step. On May 15th, under pretext of taking the deputies a petition in favour of Poland, a movement against the chamber took place. The mass of the people intended only a pacific demonstration in favour of a people they wished to help. The president, Buchez, had not thought it necessary to take precautions. Lamartine tried in vain to calm the intruders by words; they crowded into the hall of the sitting to the number of more than two thousand. The bureau and the tribune were invaded; Blanqui demanded that the assembly should at once declare war on Europe in order to deliver Poland. Barbès demanded that a tax of a milliard should be imposed on the rich. At last the president was driven from his seat and Huber pronounced the dissolution of the assembly. Happily some battalions of the *Garde mobile* and the National Guard were at hand; they dispersed the insurgents; the assembly resumed its sittings. Lamartine and Ledru-Rollin, at the head of the representatives of the National Guard, marched on the Hôtel de Ville, where Marrast, the mayor of Paris, arrested a new provisory government which had wished to install itself; the agitators were taken to Vincennes.

Troubles in June.—This movement, a sad and senseless parody of the famous days of the first revolution, achieved the result of putting the National Assembly in defiance of the Parisians. It resolved from the disorders of the national *ateliers* an army of 100,000 unemployed with arms, leaders, and discipline. This news excited the anger of those agitators who were still free, and the despair of those workmen deceived by dangerous utopians. On the 22nd barricades were erected with lightning rapidity in the *faubourgs* and soon spread over half of Paris. The executive commission had at its disposal only a twentieth

part of the 1000 soldiers of the line, the *Garde mobile*, and a part of the National Guard. General Cavaignac, Minister of War since the 18th of May, established his forces on all the chief streets between the assembly and the Hôtel de Ville. On the 24th that dreadful battle—in which legions of the National Guard fought against legions of Parisians, in which the *garde mobile* composed of the young sons of the people fought against the workmen—was not yet decided: on both sides there had been cruel losses. The assembly, to augment the government forces and concentrate authority in the hands of one man, obliged the executive commission to resign and made Cavaignac chief of executive power. On the 25th General Bréa was assassinated at the moment when he was treating with the insurgents at a barricade near Fontainebleau; General Damesme was killed in an attack on the Pantheon, General Négrier at an assault on the barricade of the Bastille; two representatives were also killed. Then the insurrection began to abate. The Archbishop of Paris, Mgr. Affre, in the hope of shortening the struggle, went towards the Bastille to submit overtures for peace to the *faubourg* St. Antoine; a short truce was made and he gained access to the *faubourg;* but the combat recommenced suddenly, a bullet shot from a window wounded him fatally and he fell, a martyr to his patriotic zeal.

But the insurrection was quelled in the *faubourg* St. Antoine. General Lamoricière ordered the insurgents to lay down their arms, under pain of bombardment. They obeyed him; this four days' battle had cost both sides 5000 killed, among whom were seven generals and two representatives; four other generals and two representatives had been wounded; 12,000 prisoners made during the insurrection or arrested after it were transported to Africa.

The republic emerged singularly weakened from this dreadful affair. The assembly hastened to lay the foundations of a new government; unity of legislative power and its delegation to a special assembly; unity of executive power and its delegation to an elected president. This was to constitute two rival powers, without an intermediary to prevent friction or avert collisions.

There were two possible candidates for the presidency of the republic: General Cavaignac, the head since June 24th of the executive power, and Prince Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, the nephew of the emperor, who on two occasions had been elected representative by three and then by five departments. General

Cavaignac, a man of noble character, had 1,448,107 votes against 5,434,226 given in favour of the prince (December 10).

Presidency of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte. — Charles Louis Napoleon, born at the Tuileries on April 20, 1808, the third son of Hortense Beauharnais and Louis Bonaparte, King of Holland, had taken part in Italy in 1831 in the insurrection of the people of Romagna against the holy see. On two occasions, in 1836 and in 1840, he had tried without success at Strasburg and at Boulogne to reawaken sympathy for the name of Napoleon and the glory of the empire. After the last attempt he was condemned by the Court of Peers and confined in the Castle of Ham, whence he escaped in 1846. The revolution of February reawakened his hopes. An active propaganda promised him many votes; the faults of the republicans, the powerful magic of his name did the rest.

The national *ateliers*, the invective of the clubs, the battles of June, and the stoppage of commerce had irritated the bourgeoisie; the tax of forty-five centimes added to the four direct taxes had been the downfall of the republican cause as far as the peasants were concerned. The election of the prince to the presidency was the occasion of a protest against the government which Paris had imposed on France on the 24th of February.

The constitution of November 12, 1848, was not likely to live in the times and conditions in which it was produced. The two powers of execution and deliberation had the same origin; both proceeded from manhood suffrage, and were both renewable, the one after three, the other after four years in power. But the president had this advantage, that, elected by millions of votes he seemed to represent the whole country, whilst, in the assembly the deputies were only elected by some thousands of votes each. Moreover, while constituting an inevitable antagonism, it had been hoped to subordinate the executive to the legislative power. And so the president, appointed to innumerable offices in the administration, negotiated treaties and disposed of the army but he was not re-eligible; he had neither the right to command the troops nor the right to dissolve the assembly nor even to stop a law process which seemed to him destructive. He had either too much or too little. And he had been given, with the temptation of resuming the habitual prerogatives of public authority, the means of forwarding his ends.

The president and the assembly were respected and listened to while they worked for the re-establishment of order and for compromise between the extreme parties. And so on January 20

and June 13, 1849, the army of Paris under their direction triumphed over the insurrection without bloodshed.

An external cause had given rise to the last conflict. European revolutions—incited by the revolution of February but in defiance of France—had been promptly repressed by the kings whom they had alarmed. Already Austria, who, thanks to Russia, had been victorious in Hungary, had defeated Charles Albert, King of Sardinia, at Novars, and Lombardy had fallen again into her power. The republic proclaimed at Rome after the flight of the pope tried in vain to make the walls of the Holy City the last ramparts of independence in the peninsula. When she was for a short time victorious, six months earlier, Italy had not wished the help of France; now that she was vanquished and threatened by a still heavier yoke policy demanded that the French government should protect the Italian peninsula from Austrian domination. But it was thought that this protection, in order to be efficacious, should be established at Rome to overthrow the republic proclaimed in that town. The prince-president and the assembly sent a French army to Italy under the command of General Oudinot. The republicans of Paris tried to save the republic of Rome by an insurrection. A member of the former provisory government, M. Ledru-Rollin, was with them. A body of troops stopped this movement at its birth on June 13. This tumult cost the party its leaders, who were condemned by the High Court of Versailles, and dispelled the last hopes of Rome. General Oudinot, after having besieged the town with the greatest forethought, entered Rome on July 2, where the pope was reinstated. The legislative assembly which succeeded the constitutional assembly, though far from being unanimous on this question, yet approved the conduct of the president; it was decided that French troops should remain in Rome for the protection of the Holy Father. From that day, France has always held troops in Italy, to the profit of the ultramontanists, but to the detriment of her general interests.

The Legislative Assembly (1849–1851).—The new assembly (May 28, 1849) contained fewer republicans or socialists and a greater number of members united under that general denomination, the love of order. The Prince Louis Napoleon seemed to sympathise with the legislative power thus constituted. But during the vacation of the assembly, in August and September, 1849, many members of the majority, partisans of the elder branch of the Bourbons, went to Germany to pay homage to the Count of Chambord; others, partisans of the younger branch,

went to England to the princes of the house of Orleans. The exiled republicans and secret societies on their part launched their diatribes which came in conflict with the manifestations of the monarchy; while the president travelled across France to exercise on the population the influence of that new power which sheltered under the name of Napoleon.

The session of 1850 was marked by the law of May 31, which erased three million electors from the parliamentary roll, exacting in return for the voting-paper a proof of three years' residence in the electoral canton. In the session of 1851 irritating discussions took the place of business. The prince-president took from General Changarnier the command of the National Guard and the army of Paris because there had been friction between him and the Ministry of War. The chamber, in revenge, refused to discuss with the president the choice of a durable government.

By an annoying coincidence, the powers of the president and those of the assembly terminated the following year, 1852, at three months' interval; manhood suffrage, which had become a restrained suffrage, was asked to renew the two powers of the republic nearly at the same time. In anxiety as to where this doubtful future might lead the country, petitions which bore 1,500,000 signatures were addressed to the assembly, asking for the revision of the constitution; eighty general councils and a great number of district councils expressed the same wish.

But the assembly was deeply divided. Many demanded that no change should be made; those accepted the revision of the article which interdicted the re-election of the president; the others wished a complete revision which would open the door to one or other of the three decayed monarchies. But in order that the assembly might proceed legally to a revision three-quarters of the votes of the house were necessary; the requisite number was not obtained. This trouble in the official world found its echo in the disorders of many departments; those of Cher and Nièvre were put in a state of siege.

The president demanded on the 4th of November, 1851, the re-establishment of manhood suffrage by the repeal of the law of May 31. The assembly, insisting that the wandering and fluctuating crowd should be excluded from the vote, refused the presidential proposition; but to counterbalance the advantage this proposal would give the prince in the eyes of the people the majority tried to take possession of the army, in limiting the right given the president by the constitution of demanding troops

directly whenever he thought his safety in danger (November 17). This project was also rejected. On the following days acrimonious debates made the situation still more difficult; some spoke of sending the prince to Vincennes. But an assembly is always too feeble to take action. In this assembly, at any rate, there was no dominating party; important propositions could only pass by the vote of the majority. The prince, on the other hand, had on his side the army, part of the population of Paris, and nearly all France which was tired of this moral disorder. He had also the unity of command; he could thus await the attack; but he preferred to forestall it; France counted one day of conflict the more.

The Ten Years' Presidency.—On the morning of December 2 the leaders of the different parties of the assembly were arrested in their homes, the palace of the assembly was occupied by an armed force, and some of the representatives who had gathered together in mayoralties were seized or dispersed.

At the same time the president declared by a decree that the assembly was dissolved, that manhood suffrage was re-established, and proposed to the people the basis of a new constitution with a responsible leader elected for ten years. "I have forsaken lawful means," said the prince, "in order to return to the law." On the 3rd and 4th resistance was attempted in the centre of Paris and on the boulevards, but without the support of the population. The army remained after a short struggle in command of the streets; attempts at insurrection in different parts of the country were soon repressed. Those departments in which trouble had broken out were put in a state of siege; those malefactors who had broken the law were transported to Cayenne; members of secret societies were transported to Algeria: these measures promptly reduced the country to order. The parties understood that they had to deal this time with a resolute power. The country by 7,437,216 affirmative against 640,737 negative votes accepted the constitution proposed by the president and conferred the presidency on him for ten years. In this way France, alarmed, gave herself into the hands of Louis Napoleon, and the great current of 1789 deviated once more. For these sixty years, instead of advancing slowly and surely by successive progress, France had proceeded by leaps and bounds, rushing in a few months from one extreme of the political world to the other; yesterday a republic with all its demagogic licence; to-morrow a dictatorship with the grandeur but also with the dangers of personal government.

The decennial presidency was only a step towards the empire. The new constitution, published on January 14, 1852, had borrowed its principles from the consulate and from the empire; under its pretended liberalism it hid the omnipotence of the prince. The head of the state was responsible and governed with the ministers who depended on him alone. Two assemblies were instituted; the legislative body, the outcome of universal suffrage, with the vote of laws and taxes; and a senate composed of celebrities of the country to watch over and develop the constitution. The councillors of state, named like the senators by the prince, prepared the laws, supported them before the legislative body, and examined the amendments. This constitution did not however surround the destinies of the nation by an impassable barrier. It left the way open for improvements which might bring back those liberties which were for the moment set aside.

Before putting the constitution in practice, the president, reverting to the dictatorship, reconsidered and rearranged the administration for four months. One of his first acts was the forced sale of all the personal property of the house of Orleans, with a return to the domains of the state of those which before his accession Louis-Philippe had ceded to his children. The reorganisation of the National Guard, which was limited in its powers and put at the disposal of the ruling power; the press again put under the jurisdiction of the tribunal courts; the departmental authority concentrated in the hands of the prefects; the nomination of mayors reclaimed by the government—these were the principal features of this rearrangement, conceived to fortify the central power.

Order prevailing once more, work recommenced. And the president met with a good reception in a progress through the provinces of the west and south. Leaving Strasburg to the cries of *Vive le President!* he arrived at Bordeaux to the cries of *Vive l'Empereur!* a cry which Paris repeated on October 16. Drawn towards the movement which had attracted her since the first vote in favour of Napoleon in 1848, the nation thought to find repose and order in a hereditary monarchy, the satisfaction of her pride before the world in the Napoleonic dynasty.

IV

THE SECOND EMPIRE

Re-establishment of the Empire (1852).—The deliberations of a consulting senate in the first assembly of the state proposed to the people the re-establishment of imperial dignity in the person of Louis Napoleon, with heredity to his direct descendants, legitimate or adopted; the people adopted this proposition on the 21st and 22nd of October by 7,839,552 affirmative against 254,501 negative votes, and the empire was solemnly declared on December 2, 1852. And so the nation ratified the events of December 2, 1851, as she had ratified that of the 18th Brumaire; she voluntarily allied her destinies with those of the Napoleons.

The new emperor took the name of Napoleon III. He had married Eugénie de Guzman, a lady of great heart, who belonged to the high nobility. He had chosen her for the throne regardless of all political calculations. The prince imperial was born of this marriage on March 16, 1856. The empire was immensely popular, the emperor was no idle monarch. He had two ends in view: at home to give satisfaction to the general needs of the country as well as to popular interests; and abroad to improve the political situation of France, which still laboured under the great reverse of 1815. The progressive development of public liberty by the improvements of the constitution would follow.

Benevolent Institutions.—The workman who lived on his wage is often threatened, on arriving at old age, with having no resources for his latter days. The savings bank had already, under the Restoration, put foresight and economy within the reach of small purses. The bank of the *Retraites* for old age, founded in 1849, reorganised in 1851, now went forward with rapid strides. In the year 1863 alone it showed 200,000 deposits. The decree of March 26, 1852, organised and generalised on a new basis the admirable institution of societies for mutual help.

In order that the poor might be sure of justice, and that the sick poor in remote districts should not feel themselves abandoned, an organisation to supply judicial help and medical services for such cases was founded.

The law for the purification of unhealthy dwellings and the encouragement given by the personal actions of the emperor to the construction of workmen's houses led to the establishment

in certain towns of more healthy dwellings without increase of rent. Convalescence, being neither the illness which opens the doors of the hospital nor the health which leads to the workshop, is often dangerous and painful for the worker. Three establishments were founded at Vincennes, at Vésinet, and at Longchène, near Lyons, for men and women convalescents who had just left hospital. Things went even further: an act was presented to the legislative body in 1867 to organise in favour of those workmen who had been mutilated at their work a bank for disabled workmen—or their widows—which assured pensions for life as well as temporary help, thus combining forethought with assistance. Finally the *Orphanage of the Prince Imperial* received at Paris many children left without their natural guardians.

Impulse was given to public work; encouragement to agriculture, industry, and art. The prodigious development of industry, in concentrating the population at certain points, had caused the accommodation of certain towns to become too restricted; communication between the different parts of the country seemed too slow, and agriculture had not profited by the advance of science as much as it should have done.

The government showed such activity in public works that in ten years nearly all the large towns had been remodelled. But this prosperity had also excited speculation and brought on disasters. Paris was rebuilt on a new and majestic plan by M. Haussmann, the prefect of the Seine; Lyons and Marseilles followed this example, which decided the municipalities of the smaller cities to allow air, light, and health to enter into the old quarters of their towns. Work on the Louvre at Paris, which had been long suspended, was now taken up and completed; the *boulevards* were opened up, the old quarters purified, new quarters created; schools, mayoralties, and churches built in every district; in the centre of the town the *Halles*—the Louvre of the people—were constructed after an original style; everywhere were gardens and promenades planted with rare trees and beautiful flowers; finally at the two extremities of the town the magnificent woods of Boulogne and of Vincennes. At Marseilles a mountain was cut away to make room for a new town; two ports were excavated to shelter the innumerable ships which began to trade with the Queen of the Mediterranean. The railways, the building of which had up till now proceeded so slowly, extended in a few years from the centre of the country to its utmost extremities, from Paris to Strasburg, Bordeaux, Besançon, Marseilles, and so on, not to mention the vast net-

work of secondary lines. Immense works were carried out in the construction of canals, roads, ports, and the restoration of churches.

The organisation of chambers of agriculture, the establishment of agricultural meetings and conferences, contributed to spread new and better methods among the agriculturalists, while an insurance society protected the work of the fields from bad fortune or uncertain seasons, and a *society of credit* offered the loan of capital at a small rate of interest. Many special laws permitted the commencement of the re-afforestation of the mountains of France, whose increasing bareness led to disasters of inundation; forests situated in the plains were cleared away that the ground might be put to utilitarian purposes, that lost communal property might add to the general prosperity. And finally a subvention of 100 millions was voted to facilitate by loans the employment of drainage; those parts of the country which had hitherto been unprofitable in cultivation it was sought to make productive. The emperor gave the example by work undertaken at his expense in Sologne, Champagne, and Gascony.

The agriculture of France was hampered by ignorance and by the want of means of communication; a law was drawn up for the construction of local railways, and elementary instruction in agriculture was prescribed in the schools to spread over all the country the conquests of science and of experience.

Institutions of Credit: Commercial Liberty.—Credit, which made advances to acknowledged capacity and honest work, and liberty, the soil in which they flourish most freely, were developed. The *Credit Foncier* (credit advanced on security of land) permitted proprietors to free themselves more easily from mortgages and to improve their lands; the *Credit Mobilier* made the fiduciary values circulate more rapidly, too rapidly in fact, for it resulted sometimes in catastrophes. A society called the *prêt de l'enfance au travail* tried to make credit available even to the poorest, on the sole condition that they were industrious and honest. And finally, in case the state should be obliged to face the expenses of a war, to contract loans, it tried to ensure that the smallest holders of capital should participate; instead of addressing itself solely to the bankers, the state wished all citizens to take part in this operation by direct subscriptions.

Economic science had established the fact that it was necessary to multiply means of exchange in order that commerce should flourish; that without competition industry would remain stationary, or would produce at prices so high that they would

hinder consumption; in fact, that without a prosperous agri culture industry must languish.

The example of England, which had successively suppressed the hindrances put in the way of commerce and industry by ancient privileges, and the sad experiences acquired during two years of want, decided the government to let France pass from the regime of protection of industry by magnified duties to that of commercial liberty. The *échelle mobile*, which was only an inconvenience to the wheat trade, was abolished; reductions of duties were successively decreed; finally, from the end of 1860 commercial treaties, which the legislative body did not unfortunately discuss, were signed with England, Belgium, Italy, Turkey, and other countries. In the terms of the treaty with England—the model of all the others—the English government admitted freely at the end of two years the manufactured goods of France, and diminished considerably the duty on French importations of wine, alcohol, and paper goods. In return, the French government removed the embargo on many goods of British origin or manufacture, and diminished progressively the duties on importation of coal, coke, iron, cast metal, steel, and all metal goods.

A humanitarian law abolished the writ to arrest and diminished the duration of preventative arrests.

In order to stimulate industrial activity, the emperor had again taken up the idea of a universal exhibition, an idea of French origin though realised for the first time by England. The emperor, in 1855, proposed an exhibition in which the industries of different peoples would be compared; the winners in these pacific contests would receive prizes which would excite the emulation of the vanquished. The universal exhibition of 1867, which showed the industrial and artistic power of France, was of an exceptional character. An important place was reserved in it for questions and products of interest to the workers; two juries were set to judge the conditions of the workers, an inquiry of which the consequences were to be considerable; prizes were awarded for *social harmony*. The workmen delegates invited to the exhibition were called to consider the reports and to express the feelings of their constituents.

Thanks to the facility of relations established by railways, steam navigation, and telegraphy, there was a more constant interchange of interests and ideas, which tended to render the destiny of France more assured. The government seconded the movement in favouring the establishment of new steamship lines

between French ocean ports and America and between French Mediterranean ports and the coasts of Asia, to increase the trade of France with distant countries. In 1862 already one could see the effects of many ably calculated measures on the commerce of France. The number of annual imports and exports had tripled in twelve years; it ultimately rose to the value of six milliards.

The same liberal spirit was found in the *law of coalitions*, passed in 1864, which consecrated, under a new form, the liberty of work: allowing the workmen to discuss among themselves the conditions under which they would sell their time, their strength, and their powers of mind. Another and less efficacious law on co-operative societies offered workmen the possibility of putting their savings together in order to form industrial establishments (1867).

Pauperism, attacked by benevolent measures, as well as by the renewed activity of work, led fewer homeless people to the temptations of misery. The progressive diminution of crime, stated year by year in judicial statistics, bore testimony to the general progress of public morality. From 1848 to 1861 the number accused diminished by more than half. But wild dreamers continued to propagate their dangerous utopias in the shadows.

Public Instruction: Advanced Studies.—The new conditions of industry and commerce made it necessary—even for the workmen—to be able to read and write. In fifteen years the number of children receiving primary instruction increased by one million; schools were multiplied and the position of the masters improved.

But although it was good to teach the people to read, it was better to put good books in their hands; in a few years 13,000 scholastic libraries were established.

The law of April 10, 1867, which improved the general circumstances of popular instruction, organised also girls schools, developed free education, and sanctioned adult schools, of which the 30,000 opened in 1867 received 830,000 pupils.

In secondary education, classical studies, which had been for a short time set aside, were again taken up; a law of June 21, 1865, organised specialised secondary education to which various branches of professional and technical education were attached. The normal school at Cluny was established to train teachers for this higher education. French industry thus obtained her special system of instruction, just as the liberal professions had found theirs for centuries in classical studies. The creation of a

general congress for the whole of France gave these two branches of education the stimulus of emulation and competition.

The sciences and higher branches of intellectual learning were also encouraged by the foundation of important prizes in the five sections of the institute; by the impetus given to the learned societies of the departments, and by the numerous scientific expeditions sent to Greece, Egypt, Asia Minor, the sources of the Nile, and so on. Finally by the side of the great professional schools which produced advocates, doctors, engineers, officers, and professors, schools were created for the theoretical advancement of science and letters. These gave every eminent man the means of adding to his discoveries, of educating his successors, and of constituting around him a scientific family.

External Policy: Wars.—Before being crowned, Napoleon III. had said: "*L'Empire; c'est la paix.*" It was a fine formula—if it could have been applied. But France did not want peace at any price. There were therefore wars in this reign which France accepted as the necessities of her traditions of national policy and military honour. There were also unfortunately wars of which she disapproved; the second empire fell through engaging in a war which was inevitable, but for which nothing had been prepared.

The conquest of Kabylie and the Algerian Sahara was a necessary operation; but France was to expiate cruelly, by the neutrality or the secret hostility of Russia, the glory gained at Sebastopol.

The Crimean War: Treaty of Paris (1854–56).—Since the treaties of 1815, Russia had exercised a threatening preponderance in Europe. The Czar Nicholas had become the personification of a redoubtable system of suppression and conquest. He had never pardoned the monarchy of July for having gone out by a legitimate movement; in Germany he had supported the kings in their resistance to the wishes of the people. He had done everything in his power to denationalise Poland, of which the treaties of 1815 recognised his possession, on condition that he would assure to that unhappy country a constitutional government. Astonished for a moment by the revolution of 1848, the czar soon returned to his old ambition. After having saved Austria in subduing the Hungarians who had revolted against her, he thought that the presence of a Napoleon on the throne of France would guarantee to Russia an alliance with England, and he thought the moment had arrived to seize that object of eternal Muscovite desire—Constantinople. On every occasion he affected

a haughty protectorate of the Christian subjects of the Turkish empire. He ended by trying to come to an understanding with England for the division between them of the spoils of the sultan. In 1853 he had the principalities of the Danube occupied, and armed an apparently formidable fleet at Sebastopol. The Emperor Napoleon gave the first sign of resistance in boldly sending the French Mediterranean fleet to Salamis to be within reach of Constantinople and the Black Sea. He drew England —hesitating at first—into his alliance and assured the neutrality of Austria and Prussia. The destruction by the Russians of a Turkish fleet at Sinope was the signal for the commencement of hostilities. The Anglo-French fleet entered the Black Sea, while an army sent from French and British ports assembled under the walls of Constantinople. On September 14, 1854, the allies, to the strength of 70,000 men, disembarked on the Crimea. The victory of Alma allowed the commencement of the siege of Sebastopol—that formidable fortress which it was necessary to destroy in order to ensure the protection of Constantinople.

This siege, the most terrible in the annals of modern history, lasted for nearly a year. Continual battles took place ; two victories, those of Inkermann and Traktir, won the soldiers less glory than their indomitable courage against a terrible climate and an enemy who received constant reinforcements. At last, on September 8, 1855, after miracles of endurance, the fury of the French and the solidity of the English had their reward ; the tower of Malakoff was carried, the town was taken. Some months before the Emperor Nicholas had died foreseeing the ruin of his vast designs.

The Anglo-French fleet in the Baltic had destroyed Bomarsund, the bulwark advanced by Russia against Sweden ; in the Black Sea the fortress of Kinburn was forced to surrender, which opened southern Russia to attack ; an allied squadron had already taken Petropaulosk in the Pacific Ocean. At last French diplomacy had brought the Kings of Sweden and of Sardinia into the league against Russia ; she might perhaps be able to induce Austria to join it also. The czar, Alexander II., the successor of Nicholas, demanded peace ; it was concluded at Paris under the supervision of the sovereign of that country which had played the most glorious part in this war. This peace (March 30, 1856) neutralised the Black Sea and thus prevented Russia from having a fleet of warships ; took from her certain parts of Bessarabia ; ensured free navigation of the Danube ; and proclaimed in the name of liberty the rights of neutrals

during naval wars. Russia recoiled; the rights of nations had taken a step forward, and France had recovered her influence in Europe. The visits of the Queen of England, the King of Portugal, the King of Sardinia, Victor Emmanuel, and other sovereigns to Emperor Napoleon III. were a striking testimony to the greatness France had again attained. But this glory was all the profit she derived from a war in which much blood had been spilled, much money spent. France had made sentiment her policy in the Crimea and England reaped the benefit. When misfortune came to France, the Russians, remembering Sebastopol, allowed her to be overwhelmed; England forgot her ally of the Crimea and did not even offer her a helping hand.

War in Italy: Peace of Villafranca and the Treaty of Zürich (1859).—After Russia, Austria was the power most opposed to modern ideas; as the first oppressed Turkey, the second oppressed Italy. Austria had played an equivocal rôle during the Crimean War, while the King of Sardinia had not been afraid to join his young army to the Anglo-French troops. This circumstance had made France the natural protector of Piedmont and consequently of Italy, of which Piedmont was the last citadel. So that when Francis Joseph, the Emperor of Austria, in spite of the efforts of European diplomacy, crossed the Ticino on April 29 (just as the Emperor Nicholas had crossed the Pruth) France again found herself fighting an aggressor on behalf of the oppressed.

The Emperor Napoleon resumed in this war the secular policy of France beyond the Alps, a policy which consisted in not suffering the preponderance of Austria or Germany in Italy, that is to say, on the south-west frontier of France. If he had, as president of the republic, contributed to the return of the pope to Rome, it was not in order to perpetuate Austrian oppression or general servitude in the peninsula. The unexpected apparition of a French army on that soil where for three centuries France had left so many glorious memories caused profound surprise. Europe was startled to attention; England looked on benevolently; Russia and Prussia were astonished observers; Austria and France were left alone to fight it out. The war lasted barely two months.

After the brilliant affair of Montebello which frustrated an attempted surprise by the Austrians (May 20), the Franco-Piedmontese army was concentrated round Alessandria; then by a bold and cleverly executed movement it turned the right of the Austrians who had already crossed the Ticino and obliged

them to cross back over that river. Caught between the army corps of General Macmahon and the guard of Magenta, the Austrians lost 7000 killed or wounded and 8000 prisoners (June 4). Two days later French regiments marched into Milan.

The enemy, astonished by this rude shock, abandoned his first line of defence, where he had long since accumulated powerful means of action and of resistance. He retired on the Adda, having vainly tried to hold the famous position of Marignano, then on the Mincio, behind the celebrated plains of Castiglione, between the two fortresses of Peschiera and Mantua. There he found himself protected by the impregnable support of the great city of Verona. The Emperor of Austria, with a new general and considerable reinforcements, had come to wait for the French army. The Austrians had for long studied this field of battle; there were 160,000 men arranged in ranks on the heights above the village of Solferino, who would be able to outflank the French on the plain. Napoleon III. had barely 140,000 men under his command and was obliged to fight on a line five leagues in extent. While the right wing engaged the enemy in the plain in order not to allow itself to be turned and while Victor Emmanuel with his Piedmontese soldiers offered a brave resistance on the left, the French centre pushed a vigorous attack, and after a heroic fight carried successively Monte Fenile, Monte Cyprès, and finally the village of Solferino. The enemy line was broken; his reserves were wiped out without having been engaged by the fire of the new French cannon. The enemy fled in a confused medley; but a terrible thunderstorm, accompanied by hail and torrential rain, stopped the victors and permitted the Austrians to recross the Mincio; they left 25,000 men *hors-de-combat*. That night the Emperor Napoleon's headquarters were in the same room which had been occupied by Francis Joseph in the morning (June 24).

Twice victorious, the emperor at once offered peace to his enemy. Italy was delivered, even if a small part of Italian territory—Venetia—still rested in the hands of the Austrians. Europe, astounded by these rapid victories, allowed all her jealousies to be reawakened.

Prussia especially strove to arouse Germany and to send an army to the Rhine. The Emperor Napoleon thought he had done enough in throwing back Austria—so lately established on the banks of the Ticino—behind the Mincio, and on July 8 he signed with Francis Joseph at Villafranca a peace the principal conditions of which were confirmed at the end of the year by

the Treaty of Zürich. Austria abandoned Lombardy, which France ceded to Piedmont, and accepted the Mincio as her frontier in the peninsula; the various states of Italy were to form a confederation under the presidency of the pope. But all those interested rebelled against this arrangement and a revolutionary movement continued. The emperor restrained himself from preventing the intervention of Austria. And thus all the governments which since 1814 had been nothing but lieutenancies of Austria were seen to be crumbling down; Italy consisted of only one kingdom, with the exception of Venice and Rome, when the emperor thought it advisable to take the necessary precautions for the safety of France: he claimed the price of the assistance which he had given and demanded that Savoy and Nice should be ceded to him by the Treaty of Turin (March 24, 1860). This enlarged France by three departments and carried her southern frontier over the crest of the Alps. For the first time since 1815 France crossed the natural boundaries traced around her at the period of her reverses—not by force or by surprises, but as a natural result of great services rendered to a friendly nation, by pacific agreement, and by a solemn vote on the part of the population of the departments in question. Europe did not dare to protest.

Expeditions of War outside of Europe, in Syria, China, Cochin China, and Mexico.—Europe was no longer isolated from the other continents; with the progress of civilisation, of commerce, and of the general relations of peoples, it was necessary for France, the second maritime power, to go beyond the seas and especially where her honour and her interests might be engaged. It was the first time which—either with or without the support of England, often under her jealous eye—France had acted with such firmness and independence.

The massacre of the Maronite Christians by the Druses of Syria demonstrated anew the powerlessness of the Ottoman empire to protect its subjects and excited the interested complaints of Russia. France, who had made the first move, had the honour of being charged by the great powers to send and maintain a body of troops in Syria to help the Turkish government to punish the aggressors. The following year a diplomatic conference met at Constantinople and regulated the government of Liban in order to prevent the return of such deplorable catastrophes.

The appearance of the French flag in the East was not without its uses in the pursuit of a great enterprise commenced by

M. de Lesseps under the auspices of the French government: the construction through the isthmus of Suez of a canal which would unite the Mediterranean to the Red Sea and put Europe in direct communication with the extreme east.

The same year France and England had been obliged to undertake at the other extremity of Asia an expedition against China, who had violated the conditions of a treaty previously entered into with her. In less than six months the allied fleets transported 15,000 men and an immense amount of military equipment 6000 leagues from the French coasts to the banks of the Pei-Ho. The Emperor of China sent 70,000 men to meet these troops whom he called *barbarians*. This army and the forts erected along the road to Pekin could not stand before the little European force commanded by General Cousin-Montauban. The mouths of the river were forced, the forts which defended them were carried by a sharp and brilliant attack, after which the allies marched resolutely on Pekin. The Chinese court tried to deceive them by false negotiations, of which some of the allied envoys were victims, and to surprise the troops, who, however, gained the Battle of Palikao. The town of Pekin, now uncovered, was about to be bombarded; already the summer palace had been seized and pillaged. Prince Kong, the brother of the emperor, then decided to treat seriously (October 25, 1860). The allied armies entered Pekin to receive the ratifications of the treaty, in virtue of which the Chinese government engaged to admit English and French ambassadors to the capital, to pay an indemnity of 120 millions, to open the port of Tien-Tsin, to guarantee advantageous commercial conditions to the victors, and to restore to France the churches and cemeteries belonging to the Christians. The celestial empire was opened up, and in consequence the empire of Japan, which had in 1858 made commercial treaties with the principal European states, was disposed, for fear of a similar lesson, to respect those treaties more carefully.

The French government profited from its force in these coasts to carry out against the empire of Annam in Cochin China an expedition begun two years earlier in conjunction with Spain. It was impossible to obtain security for French missionaries or French commerce from the government of Annam. France had resolved to found a settlement at the mouth of the great river Cambodge, and had seized Saïgon, which it proposed to make the capital of the new colony. But there were continual disturbances there. On their return from China the French troops defied the Annamites, seized Mytho,

Bien-Hoa, and imposed a peace on the Emperor Tu-Duc (1863) which stipulated that respect was to be shown to missionaries, secured an advantageous commercial treaty, and the possession of three provinces surrounding the mouths of the Cambodge in an admirably fertile country between the Indies and China and within reach of the Philippines and the Moluccas. "The settlement of Saïgon," said an English traveller, "could change the direction of commerce and become the centre of an empire equal one day perhaps to that of India."

And so France, which had been regarded as above all a continental power, carried her activities to the most remote shores of the ocean. She was soon called to the other end of the world. For a long time France, England, and Spain had had injuries to avenge and claims to make against the anarchical government of Mexico. In the beginning of the year 1862 the three powers came to an understanding to proceed together in that country. The expedition was in course of preparation when the cabinets of London and Madrid, following misunderstandings, renounced the enterprise. France, left alone, persisted in avenging the common injuries. A rebuff had compromised the honour of the flag; a fault had been committed in declaring that France would not treat with President Jurez, which forced France either to import a foreign government into that country or to conquer these immense wastes. It was necessary to send, instead of the 6000 men already on the way, as many as 35,000 soldiers. Puebla offered a heroic resistance; but it was the key of Mexico; the army took it (May 18, 1863). Some days later (June 10) the army entered Mexico and the population proclaimed an Austrian prince, the Archduke Maximilian, emperor, on the advice of France. After the departure of the French troops in 1867 this unhappy prince was shot by the republicans after a trial which was nothing but a mockery. This imprudent and ill-conceived expedition was a grave check to the policy and the finance of France.

Transformation of the Authoritative Empire into the Liberal Empire.—Thus in a few years France had given security to the Turkish empire; unity to the Roman provinces; independence to Italy; guarantees of existence to the Christians of Syria; and the entry of Christianity, of commerce, and of influence into China, Cochin China, and Japan.

At home numbers of towns had been transformed; the country was covered with an immense network of railways; agriculture had changed the face of many provinces; industry held its own

with that of England; and commerce transported produce to the value of six milliards. The labouring classes had found in the benefits of work, which was everywhere developed, an increasing well-being, and in the benevolent institutions multiplied by the spirit of charity relief for their miseries. In the towns, it is true, the workmen were always agitated by social questions and by recollections of the republic; but the country people, content to sell their produce every year to better advantage, asked nothing but the continuation of these prosperous times.

As for the bourgeoisie, enriched by an industry whose remarkable expansion was due to the liberty of work and of commerce, they claimed for public life the liberties and guarantees for which they had developed both the taste and the need in dealing with their own special affairs; and which they had momentarily sacrificed in 1852 for fear of civil disorder. They hoped for the suppression of official candidates, to free the country from its leading-strings, to arrive at a sincere representation of the national will; they intended that in conformity with the ideas of 1789 the state should be conducted like a great industrial society, with economy and prudence, to the sole profit and by the sole action of those interested.

In these days, the dictatorship could only be temporary; Napoleon III. knew that, and at the very moment when he took possession of the throne he had promised that liberty should one day crown the new political edifice. After Solferino he longed to bring liberty into all French institutions.

He commenced this work by the decree of November 24, 1860, which associated the legislative body more directly with the policy of the government. He continued it by the consulting senate of December 2, 1861, which deprived the emperor of the right of decreeing extraordinary credits in the interval of the sessions; by the letter of January 19, 1867, which gave the ministers free entry to the chambers so that they could at any moment give an account of their proceedings to the country; by the laws in connection with the press, now replaced under the common law; and the laws on reunions, of which few proved useful while many proved disastrous (May 11 and June 6, 1868). Finally, when the unfortunate issue of the Mexican expedition, the threatening position taken up by Prussia in Germany after the victory of Sadowa over the Austrians; when at home the progress of public opinion, favoured by the general prosperity—when all these quickened the desire for liberty, which the elections of 1869 testified, the emperor renounced his personal

power, and by the consulting senate of April 20, 1870, proposed to the French people the transformation of the authoritative empire into the liberal empire. On the 8th of May 7,300,000 citizens answered this question in the affirmative, against 1,500,000 in the negative.

To put the organisation of the country in touch with the new constitution, great reforms were necessary. For a long time, in consequence of an excessive centralisation, France had resembled an inverted pyramid; the head supported everything. It was necessary to reverse the pyramid and place it on its base, that is to say, it was necessary to base the institutions of the *state* on the more numerous institutions of the *commune*, of the *department*, even in certain things of the *province*, where men of whom the state had need were preparing themselves and who would at the same time prevent excess of liberty and excess of power. It was also necessary to simplify and rejuvenate the administration, to instruct and prepare the people, to make citizens by the practice of an austere liberty, and to make patriots by a moral and national education of the whole people. But for this great movement the time and the men were lacking.

War with Prussia (July, 1870, to February, 1871).—A great mistake had been made before Sadowa. In the thought that the unity of Germany was possible with and by Austria, France had allowed that power to be crushed. The danger for France was not at Vienna but at Berlin. Prussia, which since Frederic the Great dreamt of reconstituting the German empire, knew very well that she could not compass that result, threatening for Europe, till after a military humiliation of France; she prepared the means to this end with an indefatigable perseverance. She intoxicated by history, by poetry, and by science the patriotism of the Germans against those whom she caused to be called in her papers the "hereditary enemy." She armed all her male population from twenty to sixty years of age; she exacted the most detailed instruction from her officers, and from the soldiers the severest discipline. And by an organisation which left no fraction of the national forces inactive, by a foresight which utilised all the resources of industry and science, she concentrated in the centre of Europe the most formidable machine for war which the world had ever seen: 1,500,000 men, disciplined and armed; every man was a soldier. And this terrifying machine she confided to men whom no scruples could arrest; they said themselves, "Force excels law," and they acted accordingly.

France saw nothing or would see nothing of these immense preparations, which were finished on her own territory by the minute and secret study of all her means of action or resistance. Ideas of peace and of economy dominated the legislative body; a blind confidence in the military superiority of France, a like defiance against the armament of the country, prevented the adjustment of the French forces to the greatness of the approaching struggle, and by the incapacity of men and the insufficiency of administration, those which did exist were not put to their best uses.

As a last master-stroke, Prussia caused that war for which she had been ardently longing, for which she had been preparing for fifteen years, to be declared against her.

To the 500,000 soldiers sent in fifteen days to the French frontier and concentrated in a small space, between Treves and Landau, France could oppose only 240,000 men scattered along a line of seventy-five leagues. They were overwhelmed in detachments at Weissembourg, Reischoffen, and Forbach by an enemy three or four times superior in number; they were defeated from afar, covered by an innumerable artillery which could carry further than the French cannon (August 4 and 6). The emperor capitulated at Sedan (September 2); Marshal Bazaine at Metz (October 27). Strasburg, where nothing had been prepared for a siege, succumbed after a bombardment which set the library and the museum on fire and threatened to ruin the cathedral. At Paris on September 4 a tumult had broken out in the chamber and overthrown the government in the face of the enemy, that is to say, it had destroyed the only power which existed to make resistance more efficacious or peace terms less heavy. Fifteen days later, the invested capital delivered its first battle, that of Châtillon. In holding the principal Prussian forces outside her walls for four months (September 18 to January 27) she gave France time to rouse herself. All the regular army, with the exception of four African regiments, was imprisoned in Germany; it was necessary therefore to improvise soldiers, officers, cannon, muskets, command. Miracles were accomplished. But war had become too scientific to allow youths fresh from their villages to cope—in spite of their courage—with disciplined and victorious soldiers. The provincial armies were crushed, and when after a siege of 131 days, after a month's bombardment, famine forced Paris to let down her drawbridges and forsake her forts, nothing remained but to submit to the law of the victor.

For the first time for four centuries France retreated. In 181 she had at least nearly kept the frontiers which were given he by her ancient monarchy; by the treaty of February 26, 1871 she was injured by a wound which will never heal, the taking from her of two of her provinces, and these the most fundamen tally French—Alsace and a part of Lorraine.

Strasburg was voluntarily given to Louis XIV. in 1681 and Metz to Henry II. in 1552. If historical fact has any weight, it is to be found on the side of France. And the Prussians did no dare to consult the populations of these provinces to know whether they wished to become German or to remain French

After having treated a population of 1,600,000 souls like a herd of cattle, it was hoped to exhaust France for a long time to come in exacting an indemnity of five milliards.

But who can estimate the tens of millions extorted under pretext of contributions of war; requisitions imposed on the communes, ransoms levied in particular cases; thefts of furniture, silver, books, artistic and scientific valuables sent beyond the Rhine; the complete destruction of houses and of châteaux, of farms and villages, uselessly and for no military purpose; cold-blooded murders, or death sentences carried out against the rights of nations; plunder under all sorts of pretexts; violence under all names; outrages of every kind, of which Germany, in her inveterate jealousy against France, rendered herself guilty during this six months' war, a war which by its methodical devastation recalled the most dreadful days of the ancient barbaric wars?

France holds the undying remembrance of much suffering caused by hypocritical ambition, of many affronts inflicted by a scientific barbarism, of 20 milliards lost to works of peace, of science, and of civilisation. But by arms or by ideas she will avenge herself, if she is wise enough to give to the world the infectious example of a society which regenerates itself in misfortune, which fortifies itself in the midst of liberty, inspiring all its children to forget former discord and reunite for one single purpose—the sentiment of duty which constitutes the greatness of the individual; the sentiment of discipline which makes the force of the people; the love of country which makes every devotion, every sacrifice easy.

As we write these lines — March 10, 1871 — it seems that such disasters must surely have exhausted all possible misfortune; but it remains to add the shame of civil war; to

show the world the monuments of our national glory thrown down by the hands of Frenchmen, our noblest citizens assassinated, our palace in flames, the whole of Paris threatened with destruction, under the watchful eyes of the Prussians, the masters in eighteen departments, who from the height of the forts joyfully contemplate the conflagration.

It was the work of the *Commune* and the *Internationale*, the one sheltering the other. The first excused itself under the pretext of restoring to Paris her legitimate rights, and giving her the right to elect her municipal officers. The second, which wished to enrol all the workmen of the country, inflamed their minds with hatred and with error. It represented patriotism as an obsolete fashion; propriety as an injustice; capital as theft; society as a detestable machine of which it was necessary to break all the springs. Those who listened to this doctrine did not see that they would be the first to be crushed under the ruins. To the women it promised that the commune would nourish, clothe, and bring up their children, that is to say, that the duties of the family would be suppressed; to the men it said that all belonged to all, as if society could subsist without the formation—continually accruing under conditions of morality—of that capital which represented only for honest people the slowly accumulated rewards of work, of intelligence, and of economy.

At first there was a hideous confusion of ignorance and perversity, of covetousness and hatred, of brutal passions and overexcited desires, from which proceeded no new ideas, no general sentiment, and which broke out in a formidable insurrection in the midst of which the reprobates of the country ran like wolves to a carcass: "Armed with blindness," said a Parisian schoolmaster obliged to live in the midst of them, "armed with blindness and led by lunatics."

But the national assembly met at Bordeaux, then at Versailles, and refused to decree a new constitution or to make an appeal to the people before the territory of France was freed from the invader. Confining the government to carry out the already established laws, it had on February 18, 1871, elected a chief of executive power, M. Thiers, who was afterwards (August 31) called President of the Republic.

The French army, reconstituted at Versailles, was obliged to make a second siege of Paris (April 2 to May 21), to force the ramparts, and sustain a deadly combat for seven days in the streets (May 21–28). As they retired the *communards* set fire

with the aid of petrol to the finest buildings and houses. The Tuileries, the Hôtel de Ville, the Palace of the Legion of Honour and the Council of State, the library of the Louvre and its 80,000 volumes, the Ministry of Finance, where they thought to destroy the titles of the national riches. Twenty other buildings, 200 houses were ruined by the flames. The Museum of the Louvre, with its treasures of art, the most precious treasures of the human race, the Palace of the Institute with its magnificent library, only escaped by the arrival of the troops.

France sustained two all but mortal wounds in two months; they caused her blood to flow and they emptied her treasury. Gold can be replaced by work. But how can the soul of the country be reanimated?—By the ever-present thought of her humiliation and her misfortunes; by the firm determination to make men and citizens; by manfully and stoutly putting things in their proper places: duty above law; responsibility beside liberty; discipline above all; discipline in the family, the city, and the state. May that be accomplished; may we be able to repeat the last words spoken by a famous German on his deathbed: he spoke of France, vanquished and despoiled, and he said: "The future lies still before her."

APPENDIX

THE HISTORY OF FRANCE FROM 1870–1914[1]

THE THIRD REPUBLIC

Situation in France before the Franco-Prussian War: Causes which led to it.—The appropriation by Germany of the Danish provinces of Schleswig-Holstein in 1864 had led France to look with alarm at her own outlying provinces. And after Sadowa (1866), when the Prussians inflicted an overwhelming defeat on Austria, France was startled into grave anxiety.

From this time collision between the two nations was inevitable, both Napoleon III. and Bismarck were engaged in secret plotting and Napoleon had no chance against the Man of Iron. He not only wanted war, he wanted France to declare it. He set about his preparations with elaborate attention to every detail. He secured the allegiance to the King of Prussia of the three independent states of South Germany, Baden, Bavaria, and Würtemburg, and he writes of this transaction in his *Reflections and Reminiscences:* "I felt convinced that the gulf which diverse dynastic and family influences and different habits of life had, in the course of history, created between the south and north of the Fatherland could not be more effectually bridged over than by a joint national war against the neighbour who had been aggressive for many centuries." Bismarck also arranged that France should stand alone in Europe at the declaration of war. South Germany was newly allied to the King of Prussia; Austria was powerless with Russia ready to descend on her should she move on Prussia, and she therefore declared her neutrality and added insult to injury by asserting that she considered France to be in the wrong. Russia hoped to avenge her defeats in the Crimea, while France was engaged elsewhere, and therefore declared her neutrality. Italy was engaged at home, and would not in any case have come to the

[1] M. Duruy, writing his final sentences in 1871—in the midst of the upheaval and chaos consequent on the war and the insurrection—did not enter fully into the events leading up to the war, nor into its outstanding features. We have therefore thought it better to indulge in slight recapitulation than to sacrifice the clearness of the narrative.

help of France, for the Empress Eugénie had urged Napoleon III. to take up arms in favour of the Catholic party in Italy and against the former allies of France. Napoleon's forces—Catholic forces—had defeated the troops of Garibaldi at Mentana in 1867. As for England, after the outbreak of war Lord Granville was instrumental in establishing a league of neutrals who bound themselves not to interfere.

There was therefore no help for France abroad. At home the emperor and indeed the whole imperial policy seemed to have lost the confidence of the country. Republican feeling was growing, reactionary and socialistic principles were rife. The emperor appealed to the nation for a vote of confidence. It was given by 7,358,786 affirmative to 1,571,939 negative votes. In spite of this there was discord at the heart of the nation. There was jealousy of the empress, who was of Spanish blood and was held to have the interests of Spain nearer her heart than those of her adopted country. There were two parties at court, one exclusively national, the other devoted to the empress, whose brilliant qualities added much to the court of the Tuileries. The emperor was now past the zenith of his powers; he had little or no control over the fortunes of France, and in his irresolution, born of increasing age and the knowledge that he could do nothing to avert the impending disaster, he fell into the power of the Bonaparte faction who, in conjunction with the empress, desired war to secure the accession of the prince imperial and to champion the Catholic cause in Europe. Although both Bismarck and the Bonaparte faction desired war, the final determining cause was the proposal to give the crown of Spain to a German prince. It was offered to him by the provisional government of Spain; France was not consulted and felt herself slighted because the prince in question, Leopold of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, was connected with Napoleon through two families, those of Beauharnais and Murat. This event was fastened upon as the *casus belli*, although relations between France and Germany had already become strained to breaking-point. The blame of the war has too often been laid exclusively on Napoleon III.; it belongs as much to France; a France who, although she saw war coming, yet refused to take it seriously or to prepare for it, who preferred rather to walk the streets shouting *A Berlin!* than to learn how to fire a gun; a France who regarded the advice of Marshal Niel, one of her military experts, much as Great Britain regarded the words of Lord Roberts before the Great War. Both Victor Duruy and

Marshal Niel had pleaded for the introduction of a system of military training into the schools of France that the youth of the country might learn the use of fire-arms and might be instructed in the principles of military drill and discipline in order that they could be rapidly prepared to defend their country should need arise. Marshal Niel, after urging this scheme in the chamber year after year, at last became bitter with the members of that body who would have none of it. "You are afraid of turning the country into a camp," he burst out, "take care that you do not turn it into a cemetery."

The Prince of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen had declined the Spanish throne on learning of the agitation the proposal had caused in France. But France refused to be mollified. The Duke of Gramont declared in the assembly that France would never tolerate the establishment of a Hohenzollern or any other German prince on the throne of Spain. France even demanded assurances from the King of Prussia that he would never assist a German prince to that throne. But it was a subtlety of German diplomacy—of Bismarck's diplomacy—to reply to this demand in such insulting terms that France could with honour do nothing but declare war and to have arranged matters so that no European power would help her.

The Bonapartists and the empress in their desire for war had overwhelmed the Liberal party under the leadership of Thiers; in some strange way they deceived themselves into thinking that France was ready for war; Ollivier, head of the Liberal ministry, is said to have declared that he "accepted it with a light heart." This famous saying of his he has since repudiated, declaring that he was all along opposed to the Duke of Gramont's demand for guarantees from Germany. He asserts that Bismarck's policy had forced France into a situation from which she could not extricate herself with honour save by a declaration of war. In any case France accepted the war without fear, but it was only in the adventurous spirit of the knights and cavaliers of old that she was ready for it. She had no conception of the thorough, relentless war-machine Germany had been preparing for fifteen years, a machine which was to roll over her by force of numbers, of disciplined training, of superiority of artillery, equipment, and transport.

Outbreak of War.—Napoleon himself assumed command of the French armies, while the Empress Eugénie was given the powers of the regency in Paris. Lebœuf was the military advisor —Lebœuf who had declared his army ready for war "down to

the last gaiter-button." The French generals were a set of gallant and fearless men. But they knew nothing of strategy; they had no war-maps; they had not studied how to utilise the railways to best advantage, how to prevent blocking and confusion in moving great forces along the comparatively few roads; both roads and railways were hopelessly inadequate for the needs of rapid transport. The French army ranged itself on a line which extended roughly from Strasburg to Metz, where Napoleon took up his headquarters. The first collision of the armies took place on August 2nd at Saarbrücken, where the French had the advantage and where the prince imperial received his baptism of fire. But it was a small advantage; it was one of the very few that fell to the French armies. Defeats came thick and fast; it was one long tale of defeats, Weissembourg, Forbach, Froeschweiler, Wörth, Colombières. The emperor, bewildered by the haste with which disasters rushed to meet him, gave over the command of the armies to Marshal Bazaine. But in Napoleon's retreat through Metz to Châlons the paraphernalia and equipages of his court blocked the roads for the urgently necessary movements of troops and artillery. Battles followed each other in quick succession, the French sometimes won small local successes, but the Germans were rapidly overrunning France. It was not a war, it was a conquest. Borny, Gravelotte, Noisseville, St. Privat, Vionville, Mars-le-Tours followed within a few days of each other, always driving the French further back. Trochu was the military governor of Paris, where the Empress Eugénie reigned supreme. She conceived the idea of turning the German right and ordered Marshal Macmahon to advance on the Belgian frontier, to attack the Germans on the flank, and thus relieve the pressure on the forces of Marshal Bazaine at Metz. This movement, which might have been successful with a large and victorious army, was impossible to the dispirited French soldiers under the command of "an honest man" who was, however, no strategist. The disaster of Sedan took place on September 1st, 1870; the French were hemmed in on a line resting on the Meuse; they were surrounded by the Prussian infantry whose artillery fired on them from the surrounding heights. By the next morning Napoleon and 80,000 men were the prisoners of the King of Prussia.

The Third Republic.—At midnight on September 4th Jules Favre, Minister for Foreign Affairs, rose in the assembly and solemnly demanded the abdication of Napoleon. Thiers proposed a provisional government. But Paris had heard of the

disaster of Sedan. An excited and angry crowd burst into the assembly and in response to their demands Favre and Gambetta, the leader of the republicans, proclaimed a republic. The scene can be imagined—the excitement and agitation consequent on a change of government, the Prussian enemy at the gate, the sense of disaster heavy on all.

The leaders of the third republic were Thiers, Gambetta, Simon, and Favre with General Trochu as military adviser. Garibaldi, fresh from his efforts in the cause of republicanism in Italy, hastened to place his experience and his sword at the service of this weak and struggling republic. For a short time he commanded a body of troops in Burgundy and in the Vosges, but he was unsuccessful and he was deeply wounded by the French criticism of his efforts; criticism which was indeed unworthy towards one who had placed his life at the service of France which so lately as 1867 had fought and defeated him at Mentana. The emperor was a prisoner in Germany; the empress fled to England with the prince imperial, after fruitless negotiations with Bismarck. The republicans held that Germany was fighting with Napoleon; now that the empire had fallen, they argued, Germany might be willing to enter into peace negotiations. But Germany was out for spoil; monarchy or republic, it was all one to her. The German troops advanced swiftly; by September 19th they were at Paris, and the first siege of Paris had begun. The republican government had been given power on the distinct understanding that it was not to cede an inch of French soil to Germany. And in spite of the overwhelming disasters of the last weeks the natural buoyancy of the French nature asserted itself. "The Prussians cannot get food," it argued: "by the time their supplies are exhausted our new armies will be ready; they will come and crush the invaders. All our disasters were due to Napoleon and the imperial policy. With our new government all will yet be well." And so Gambetta left Paris by balloon on October 7th, determined not to be confined by the power of the enemy while there was work to be done for France.

Leon Gambetta (1838–1882) had first appeared in Paris as a "raw young barrister." He rapidly came to the front and was returned to the assembly of 1869 as a republican of extreme views, belonging to the party known as the *irreconcilables*. At Tours, to which he made his way, he assumed practically dictatorial powers. There he raised new armies, infecting all around him with his own burning enthusiasm. His plan was to raise

four armies, which when ready would march on Paris from different sides and utterly destroy the starving Prussians. But in the meantime Metz, which had been besieged under General Bazaine, capitulated. This not only released the German army which had held it, but lost to France the last divisions of her regular army, who were now prisoners in German hands. Gambetta declared a levy *en masse*, but in spite of the brave fight shown by the French from October till January, their attempts to oust the foreigner from their land were all doomed to failure. Then Gambetta conceived the idea of drawing off the enemy by invading Germany. General Bourbaki was to attempt the relief of Belfort then enduring a siege at the hands of the German General Werder. But it was a vain attempt. Bourbaki and his brave men fought many battles, but after repeated defeats they were obliged to fall back on the Swiss frontier; once over the border they had to lay down their arms. They arrived in Switzerland half-starved and frozen, presenting the same pitiable spectacle as the soldiers of the great Napoleon had done on their return from Moscow.

Favre and Bismarck now met for a second time at Versailles —the first meeting had been futile because Favre was not in a position to treat on the basis of territorial concessions which Bismarck demanded. Now, however, an armistice was signed to leave the way open for the election of a national assembly which would discuss peace terms. Gambetta, an out and out republican, who had no use for compromise, wished to prevent all those who had held public office in the imperial government from exercising the franchise. This would not have suited Bismarck, who foresaw that by having the new assembly composed of fundamentally opposite elements, he would secure a weak and comparatively powerless body; whereas if Gambetta carried his scheme and had a majority of red-hot republicans, the assembly would be a powerful and determined adversary. Bismarck desired the resignation of Gambetta, which the latter gave in on his own account when his colleagues entered into peace negotiations. For Gambetta belonged to the *No Surrender* or *A Outrance* party; the clergy, the peasants, and the bourgeoisie, who were all for peace, opposed him and leagued themselves together under the *liste de la paix*. Though Gambetta may in a sense be called the founder of the republic, it was to Thiers—statesman and historian—a cautious and sound politician, that France owed her reorganisation. He was already an old man in his seventy-fourth year; he had been premier of

France as early as 1836; he had been banished by the emperor in 1851 for opposing the imperial policy; and after his return to France he had devoted himself to writing his *Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire*. He did not re-enter political life till 1862.

Since the outbreak of war Thiers had travelled all over Europe, trying vainly to enlist the sympathy of the courts and to secure support for peace terms such as France could accept. The *Treaty of Frankfort*, signed on May 10, 1871, decreed that Alsace and a large part of Lorraine should be given to Germany, France to retain the fortress of Belfort. It may be said here that this appropriation on the part of Germany determined from that day another war between these two countries. For Alsace and Lorraine belonged to France by natural ties of blood, of character, of spirit, and even to a large extent of language—while even the German-speaking Alsatians were French at heart. Germany has tried in vain to force the French-speaking population to speak German; the official papers and correspondence of the French-speaking communes had to be written in German, only German plays were allowed in the theatres. It was all to no purpose; no man-made laws can change the spirit of patriotism which is as much a part of a man's being as the members of his body. France, though it was a wound too deep for speech, could never forget this rending from her of two of her provinces. It was Gambetta who said, "Let us always think of them, but never speak about them." The words of an Alsatian peasant put this more simply and forcibly than the words of any foreigner can do. "You don't know the Alsatian," he says, "he detests gestures and talk. He holds firm. He hides his feelings. He does not show his roots to the world. He is an Alsatian; that is all. They killed my grandfather at Sedan. And I, I have to serve Germany (as a soldier). But that does not remove the fact that they killed my grandfather. Only it is useless for me to chalk that up on the doors. I know it. That is enough. It will be paid for when the great days come. Meanwhile one tries to live." [1]

As well as this territorial annexation, Germany exacted a huge war indemnity of £200,000,000 in order that she might pay with French gold for the outrages, insults, and brutalities her soldiers had inflicted on France. More than that, German soldiers were to be kept in France till the last franc had been paid. Thiers, who was made president of the republic in 1871—he was supposed by the Orleanists to be of their camp—by his

[1] From *On Changerait Plutôt le Cœur de Place*, by Benjamin Vallotton. Quoted from the review of this book in the *Spectator* of August 25, 1917.

skill and energy, aided by the splendid generosity of the French people in subscribing the loans, achieved the evacuation of French territory by the German troops two years before it was expected (July, 1873). The indemnity was paid up too soon for Bismarck, who had hoped to cripple France for many years to come by the raising of this colossal sum.

The Assembly of Bordeaux.—On February 8th, 1871, the elections for a new assembly had taken place. Paris being in a state of tumult, the assembly met at Bordeaux. Although it was composed of distinguished men, the brilliant powers of its individual members had no chance to shine. For the assembly was composed of four different parties, each striving for its own particular ends. Jules Grévy was the president, Grévy who had taken an oath of allegiance to the emperor in order to secure his election. But though the republic had been proclaimed and the assembly met as a republican assembly, we find the strange fact of a nominally republican body having a monarchist majority (400 monarchists against 350 republicans). There were three different parties of monarchists and each was striving for the return of its own particular candidate to the throne of France. The Bonapartists, a small but energetic body, lost no opportunity of furthering the cause of the Napoleonic dynasty; the legitimists supported the white flag of the monarchy-by-divine-right in the person of the Count of Chambord, the grandson of Charles X.; the Orleanists supported the tricolour, their "Pretender" being the Count of Paris, grandson of Louis-Philippe. The republicans constituted the fourth party.

Thiers was the head of the executive power; Gambetta was not in office, but was the champion of the republic; Garibaldi had been returned, but declined to take part in the government of a foreign country. It was decided that the assembly should in future hold its meetings at Versailles. But a tumult raged in Paris between the supporters of the government and the revolutionaries, and in the departments between the followers of Gambetta and the coalition of the opposition. Paris had capitulated on March 1st; German troops marched through the Champs Elysées and occupied the city for two days, and the King of Prussia was proclaimed Emperor of Germany at Versailles on March 16th. The Commune of Paris was declared on March 18th. That is to say the *communards*, hot-headed revolutionaries who felt that the assembly was composed mostly of monarchists and would be of little use to them, broke into active opposition. Paris, they declared, was to be a free town, governed

by its own citizens. The assembly was already at Versailles ; the regular soldiers freed by the capitulation of Paris followed the government to Versailles, where they were joined by the soldiers of Metz and Sedan, now liberated by the Germans.

Thiers, in the name of the Versailles Assembly, charged Marshal Macmahon to reduce the seething capital to order with these forces. This was the second siege of Paris, which lasted from April 2nd till May 21st, and was followed by the *Bloody Week*, the greatest massacre in the history of the world—a week of street-fighting, of the burning of public buildings, all the dreadful conditions of a blood-thirsty chaos. Thiers by his high-handed management of this affair is held to have been partly responsible for the desperate nature it assumed in its last week. Macmahon had conquered the *communards* and had entered Paris, but in revenge for their defeat they executed their threat of burning all the public offices. Macmahon in his turn took his revenge. At his orders—and he was acting of course under Thiers—17,000 citizens of Paris were shot down and that after his army had accomplished its aim : 51,000 more were arrested and imprisoned, to be shot or transported at a later date. And all this time the Germans, encamped on the heights around Paris, were enjoying the sight of the people they had defeated slaughtering each other by thousands. Is it too much to see in this the influence of Germany ? Is it possible to believe that Bismarck had nothing to do with this insurrection which so greatly strengthened his hand ? It has been ascribed to various causes: some see in it a struggle between capital and labour, some, as has been said, thought it a protest against the reactionary weakness of the Assembly of Versailles. And it is not impossible that smouldering fires were fanned into flame by German intrigue. Whatever its causes, its results were far-reaching and they were both good and evil. It has been asserted that in spite of its cruelty the *Bloody Week* was the means of reducing to submission that Parisian mob which all through the history of France was ready to rise and settle disputes by the shedding of blood. One obvious reason why the massacre effected this change was that thousands had now expiated their own sins and those of their forefathers by their blood : that class was practically wiped out by the slaughter or transportation of 70,000 persons in one week. Whatever may be said for or against the policy of Thiers which led to this massacre, the fact remains that it alienated the French people from their government for many years to come. "No condition of things," writes

Professor Emile Bourgeois, "could have appeared more hopeless for a nation whose soil was in foreign occupation, whose fortunes were wrecked, on the morrow of a civil war which had brought bereavement and ruin and had left a legacy of bitter animosities." [1]

The Assembly of Versailles.—In the feeble and reactionary Assembly of Versailles Gambetta did not allow his political sight to be blinded by his own passionate belief that the future of France lay in republicanism. He saw that his extreme views only weakened Thiers, the president of the republic and leader of the moderate party, and that the monarchists were strengthened in consequence. With the generosity characteristic of wide views, he abandoned what lay nearest his own heart and steered a course for *opportunism*, which has since been the policy of all subsequent government in France. He founded a periodical, the *République Française*, in which he laid this new policy before the public. Gambetta exerted extraordinary power by his eloquence. "His very presence was eloquent, his voice, his gestures, his face, his accent—these were in themselves arguments well-nigh irresistible." [2] Jules Ferry, who was elected to the Chamber of Deputies in 1873, was another of the great forces of the republic; he and Gambetta opposed clericalism with equal violence, as we shall see later. Thiers had by this time definitely left the Orleanist party and had come over to Gambetta's *opportunism;* these two worked hand in hand and were the leaders of that period.

The assembly had, as we saw, a decided majority in favour of monarchism, but its division into three parties made it powerless. The death of Napoleon III. at Chislehurst, whither he had gone to rejoin the empress and the prince imperial in 1871, created no feeling one way or the other in France. The power of the Bonapartes had been finally broken at Sedan. The prince imperial entered the English military academy at Woolwich and on the outbreak of the Zulu war he volunteered for active service. He fell in that war in the service of his adopted country (1879).

The assembly had been appointed to deliberate on the question of peace or war, and though it afterwards clung to power, none of the parties in it regarded it as a permanent body. Thiers was forced to resign on May 24th, 1873, by the monarchists, who saw that they could no longer push their views under his increas-

[1] *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. xii. p. 92.
[2] Lavisse et Rambaud, *Histoire Générale*, vol. xii.: "*La Troisième République.*"

ingly republican tendencies. Marshal Macmahon was the second president (1873–1879), "an honest soldier," as he described himself, but certainly not a great statesman. He was probably elected for that reason, because the stronger spirits in the assembly thought they could drive him as they wished. He established a cabinet with a premier, a body which stood and fell together, a contrast to the system under which the president of the republic was prime minister *ex officio*, who could dismiss the ministers individually as they failed to meet his views. This body of six ministers and the prime minister was called the *Septennate*. Broglie and Fourtou were the leaders at this time. Taking advantage of the subjection of the Bonapartists and the repression of the people since the *Bloody Week*, they sought to advance the cause for the monarchy by uniting the Bourbon and Orleanist parties. The Count of Chambord had no children and agreed that the Count of Paris should be regarded as his lawful heir. These negotiations fell through in a curious way, because the representatives of the tricolour and the white flag each refused to adopt the colours of the other. There was now no immediate course to be followed up, and the assembly gave itself over to the formulating of a new constitution. This cabinet, under the leadership of General Cissey, was known as the Business Cabinet.

Constitution of 1875.—The main features of the constitution may be briefly mentioned, as virtually the same constitution prevails to this day.

The president of the republic was to be elected for seven years by the two chambers which were to meet together for that purpose. The president had not much power in those days save that of electing the ministers; if he was supported by the Senate he could dissolve the Chamber of Deputies. The Senate was composed of 300 members, one-fourth of whom were elected for life; the other three-fourths were elected for nine years, but not all at one time. Elections took place every three years, when one-fourth of the members were elected, so that every three years a quarter of the senate was replaced by new blood. In the lower chamber the deputies were elected by manhood suffrage as before. The members were paid a salary of about £365 a year; a deputy could not be elected till he was twenty-five years of age, a senator till he was forty. The cabinet was to consist of twelve ministers, appointed by the president; they might be drawn from either chamber, but as a matter of fact the Chamber of Deputies has always been more largely represented in the government. In this constitution the executive body was

entirely subjugated to the legislative body. The first or prime minister had the portfolio of the office which happened to be the most important at the time. The Versailles Assembly was not dissolved till June 25th, 1877. By that time Gambetta and Thiers together had formed the party known as the *Opportunists*, these joined the *irreconcilables* or extremists in opposing the body known as the *party of order*, that is to say, the Orleanists, the legitimists, and the imperialists. The country had grown increasingly republican and in 1877 a republican majority was returned. Thiers had died just before the elections, but the death of this aged statesman was if anything a help to the republican cause, for the people remembered with gratitude all that he had done for France and paid the last respect to his memory in returning to the assembly a republican majority.

The Reconstruction of France: Military Service, Army, and Navy.—The Germans expelled, the indemnity paid, France set to work with incredible energy to the task of building up a ruined country, filling an empty treasury, uniting a nation composed of contrary elements. The devastation caused by the German armies had to be made good, bridges and roads repaired, the ruins of Paris had to be cleared away, and the work of reconstruction begun. Marshal Niel's dreams of reform for the military service at last came true. In 1872 a law was passed decreeing service with the colours for five years for the manhood of France. This law pressed most heavily on the working classes; others were able to escape with one year's service on educational grounds. But heavy as it was the burden was endured without murmuring for the sake of the country. In less than eight years France could hold up her head again as one of the great European powers: in half that time she could have mobilised an army of more than 2,000,000 men. From all her various vicissitudes—and surely no nation has ever experienced so many violent changes of fortune—France had risen again: she never rose more buoyant, more hopeful, more resolute than from the war of 1870.

In July, 1889, a new law was passed reducing the period of service to three years; six years later, in 1905, another law came into force, the *loi de deux ans*, limiting service to two years, but making it compulsory for the manhood of the country with none of the former exemptions, except on medical grounds. France had to try to keep her forces up to something approximating to the number of the German forces; Germany had a much greater population to draw upon and did not require to train all her male population, while in France it was imperative that every

man not medically unfit should be trained to defend his country.

France had to bear heavy taxation to meet this reorganisation of her army and the repayment of the loan so willingly subscribed by the people to pay the indemnity. With the thought of Alsace and Lorraine in their hearts the French were ready for any sacrifice that they might be able some day to reclaim their provinces and to enforce their claim. There was a strong party in France whose watchword was *La Revanche*. Huge fortresses were built as a protection against aggression on her north-east frontier, fortresses which, owing to the heavy artillery of a later day, were destined to be of so little use.

The French army system of the years preceding the Great War prescribed twenty-five years' service for every able-bodied Frenchman. He was called to the colours when he became twenty-one years of age ; after two years' active service he was passed to the active army reserve ; after thirteen years he was passed on to the territorial army, from which he was finally discharged on the day when he had served France for twenty-five years. In addition to her active home army, which included about 55,000 Algerian soldiers, or *Turcos*, and a little over 20,000 Tunisian troops, France had her colonial army in France and her colonial forces overseas. Altogether she could put an active army of about 1,350,000 men in the field, while her forces behind the lines would be about 3,450,000 men. The president of the republic was *ex officio* commander-in-chief of the army, but an Army Council of generals, presided over by a vice-president and under control of the Minister for War, had practical charge of military affairs. The vice-president, in the event of war, was to have control of the armies in the field as commander-in-chief or generalissimo.

The men of the French navy were secured by voluntary enlistment. They became members of the *armée de mer* at the age of twenty and were obliged to serve for seven years, of which two would be passed on furlough. The navy was presided over by a Minister of Marine who was generally a civilian appointed by the president. The Navy Council was also composed of civilians, but an admiral or vice-admiral assisted the Minister of Marine and was responsible for the organisation of the fleets. At the outbreak of the Great War the French navy ranked next in importance after those of Great Britain and Germany.

Religious Difficulties.—The Catholic Church, whose fortunes were inextricably interwoven with those of France, was shaken to its depths by the Franco-Prussian War. France was the

home of Catholicism ; it was stronger there than in any other country, but difficulties between France and Rome had been present all through the history of France. One of the most powerful organisations in the state, governed and owing fealty to an outside power, Catholicism was bound to conflict with the state. With the fall of Napoleon III. and his dynasty, the pope lost a powerful ally, who as late as 1867 had been fighting his battles. Weakened by this cause, the pontiff was compelled to retire to the Vatican, whence he has rarely since emerged. Many of the clergy and members of the religious orders who had been hardly dealt with at an earlier period of French history had gradually come back to France when opposition died down. They had for the most part taken up teaching and educational work, so that in 1870 they exercised great authority in the state. After the war it was natural for France in her distress to turn to the Church for help. Too often where she looked for Christianity she found only politicians seeking to advance the temporal power of the pope. It was against this spirit that Gambetta cried *Le clericalisme ! Voilà l'ennemi !* for clericalism was of course bound up with the Bonapartists. The *coup d'état* known as the *seize Mai*, 1877, was a trial of power between the state and the clerical party. Jules Simon, the prime minister, had been compelled by the assembly to adopt certain moderate measures of legislation against the Church. Macmahon exercised his presidential powers and dismissed Simon. This step was regarded as a reactionary one in favour of the clerical party, and so when a decidedly republican government was returned to the assembly of 1877, war against the clerical party was one of the chief features of its policy. The very schools were infected with the anti-clerical tendency, for Victor Duruy, who had been made Minister of Public Instruction by Napoleon III., had been inclined in that direction. Another force which militated against the churches was freemasonry—*Devil-worship*, as the clerical party called it —which began to take a powerful grip of the country about this time.

It was in 1880 that a measure proposed by Jules Ferry, who succeeded Duruy as Minister of Public Instruction, was passed, expelling from France those of the religious orders which did not conform to certain regulations laid down by the government. This law was aimed at the Jesuits, who were thus expelled from the country. Though it relieved certain abuses it also drove out of the country many noble men and women who were doing good work, and it led those who were left to adopt an uncom-

promisingly anti-clerical attitude lest they should be suspected of secret sympathies with the clerical party. It must be remembered that it was against the clerical party that France waged this war, not against religion and not against individual priests or individual members of the religious orders: it was the system she attacked, not the kernel of Christianity within. Leo XIII. on his accession softened matters a good deal by urging his children in France to forget their political dreams, to make the crucifix the object of their sole desire, "for all civil power," he said, "comes from God." The events which led to the Law of Separation will be considered later.

The Protestants, never a strong body in France, were reduced by half their number when Germany appropriated half of Protestant France. At the present day the country of the Huguenots has only a small body of Protestants in her midst. The Hebrew religion is also recognised by the government and the Jews legally enjoy exactly the same rights as other citizens and are well to the front in the intellectual life of the nation. But the Dreyfus case showed how they had come to be persecuted by a party in the state and by the clerical party; it was this persecution on their part of another religious body which led to the separation of the French Catholic Church from the state. Free-thought was another serious difficulty in the religious life of France. Many of the younger and more thoughtful republicans were steeped in the writings and the thought of Renan, St. Simon, Comte, and others of that school: it was Christianity they wanted, Christianity at its deepest and simplest, not obscured by and mixed up with political motives. There was, therefore, a strong intellectual movement in favour of free-thought and that remains to this day one of the great religious problems of France. The time may come—and many great French writers and thinkers are showing the nation how to bring it nearer—when all who do good work in the world may come to see that all are working for the same ends: that all are travelling towards the same goal although by different paths.

Germany again threatens France: Relations between France and Russia.—In September, 1872, when Germany and Austria seemed about to enter into an alliance against France, the czar, Alexander II., seeing that the friendship of France was necessary to Russia, procured the assistance of England and the danger was averted. Both in 1873 and 1875 the Prince of Wales, afterwards King Edward VII., had to intervene between Germany

and France to prevent France from being forced into war. Von Moltke and the war party in Germany wanted war and Bismarck was bitterly annoyed with himself that he had not asked for a larger war indemnity from France; he had meant to paralyse her for years to come, and now when his plans had miscarried he wanted to set on France again and make her a negligible quantity in European politics for the next quarter of a century or perhaps for longer. Von Moltke thought war would be "both agreeable and useful; it would reduce France to impotence and would give Germany with little effort a new sheaf of laurels."[1]

Another reason for Germany's threatening attitude at that time was that France was passing measures for the building up of her army, a policy which Bismarck of course wished to check. It is interesting to remember that already at that time Edward VII. had shown his powers as mediator and had adopted the course he was to follow as the author of the *Entente Cordiale*. Queen Victoria also helped France at this time (1875) by a "severe" letter she wrote to the German emperor. But in 1878 at the *Congress of Berlin* Bismarck tried to cause trouble between England and France and to lead France to dissipate her strength on eastern conquests instead of devoting all her energies to the building up of the home country. This *Congress of Berlin*, at which all the European powers were represented, was regarded as the last monarchical congress; the delegates had to report progress to their rulers and not to the people of their countries. Bismarck presided and held all the other members in the hollow of his hand. He pulled the strings. The meetings were held in a richly decorated ballroom, the delegates wore magnificent uniforms and orders blazing with precious stones. Its outward show was as brilliant as its results were futile and insignificant. The delegates were Disraeli and Lord Salisbury from England, Prince Gortschakov from Russia, while Austria, Italy, and France sent their ministers for foreign affairs; the smaller countries were also represented. What little was accomplished at the congress was accomplished in secret between the individual members, not at the formal meetings. Each minister was busy making secret treaties for his own country, and no one knew what his neighbour was plotting. The resulting *Treaty of Berlin*, while making many unimportant arrangements for the smaller powers, led two years later to the alliance between Germany and Austria, secured by the former not so much for the sake of the friendship of Austria as to ensure that she would

[1] Yves Guyot, *Causes and Consequences of the War*.

not join with France. Bismarck's one ideal was the greatness of Germany, and to accomplish that end he was prepared to employ any means. Disraeli returned to England describing the results of the congress as "Peace with honour." A French writer describes it differently. "The treaty," he says, "is the result of a compromise between English fear of a Slavic advance and everybody else's fear before the threatening war. It is a document of opportunism, the fruit of hostile rivalries."[1]

The czar is reported to have said to the French minister as early as 1875: "We have common interests; we should hold together." And although Bismarck succeeded in getting Russia and Austria to sign an agreement—since called the *Dreikaiserbund*—at Skiernowice, to prevent as he hoped the alliance of France and Russia, he failed. The friendly feeling between France and Russia was strengthened in 1893 by a visit of the Russian fleet to Toulon and culminated in 1896 in an agreement signed by President Faure with Nicholas II. A treaty with Italy was concluded in 1900.

France has been led by able politicians and thinkers; we may be allowed to quote a few words by one of them, Etienne Vacherot, who was professor of philosophy at the Sorbonne, but who on refusing to take the oath of allegiance to the emperor was exiled. He subsequently served France as a deputy in the assembly of the third republic. About 1881 he wrote, "The balance of European power is the end towards which our national policy should tend now that France is able to look beyond herself. This policy does not bring a nation glory, but it enables it to live with honour and security. That balance can only be maintained by means of alliances. France can find opportunity to ally herself now with England, now with Russia, now with Italy, and now again with those three powers simultaneously, if a common and compelling interest urges such a coalition in the interest of European equilibrium, threatened by the predominance of Germany, strengthened by Austrian support."[2]

We see from these words that the thinkers of France were not in any doubt as to the intentions of Germany. Nor could the politicians have been, for speaking of a possible war with France on the question of Alsace, Bismarck had said that if war should come, Germany must crush France so that she would be unable

[1] Bénoit Brunswik, *Le Traité de Berlin*. Quoted from *The Diplomacy of the Great War*, by Alfred Bullard.
[2] *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. xii. p. 99.

to attack again for at least thirty years. And Germany was constantly increasing her army and trying to become so powerful that all other nations would be afraid to enter into a war against her. The Triple Alliance between Germany, Austria, and Italy, first entered into in 1882 and renewed in 1901, made it imperative that Russia and France should hold together; the *Entente* between the latter country and England dates from the beginning of the twentieth century.

Agriculture, Industry, and Commerce.—The extraordinary recuperative power shown by France after the war of 1870 was due in great part to her hardworking middle-class and peasantry, whose thrifty lives of laborious toil have always been a strength to France. The vast accumulation of wealth in the country may be traced partly to their savings, partly to the rich natural resources of France, partly to the climate. The rapid recovery of the country was also due—perhaps most of all—to the natural buoyancy and hopeful disposition of the race. Agriculture, industry, and commerce took a remarkable leap forward after the war, and trade flourished as it had not done for years. To assist the agriculturists a foreign wheat duty was imposed, sugar-refineries and the making of sugar from beetroot were encouraged, silkworm and silkspinning industries—always among the chief industries of France—were aided by the government; the vine-growers, who were greatly handicapped by disease among their vineyards, were given a large grant to enable them to combat it and stamp it out; the culture of oyster-beds, another great national industry, was encouraged. Peasant proprietors were urged to form what were practically trades unions so that they could improve their land, add to their store of tools and machinery, and improve their buildings. The breeding of horses was subsidised by the government; large loans were made to agriculturists; colleges of agriculture, schools of woods and forests, were established; dairy and cheese farms were set up. The French farmers took up that intensive system of farming now known by their name, enriching their land by the plentiful use of artificial manures; science was brought in where before rule-of-thumb and the mercies of nature had been expected to perform miracles with little help from man. The soil was studied and analysed to ascertain what properties it lacked and these were added by artificial manures. This new system led to heavy and repeated cropping.

France has always been hampered for want of coal. This drawback was greatly mitigated by the sinking of new mines

and the better management of those already in existence. Great factories were established, blast furnaces and all sorts of iron foundries were instituted ; the railway system was extended and the whole country was put in a state of active efficiency. Money and labour seemed of no account so long as the desired result was attained. It must be remembered that the sword was hanging over France ; she had an ever-present menace driving her on to greater efforts.

Leaders of the Country from 1879 to 1899: General Boulanger and his Movement.—Macmahon was succeeded in the presidency by Grévy in 1879. He was not a great man, he had no width of outlook, and he was only re-elected in 1885 because the French people showed signs of impatience at the constant quarrels among their republican leaders and were prepared to go back to the monarchy. In view of this prevailing feeling in the country Grévy, who was a man of colourless political views, was returned in the hope that this continuity of office might make the people believe their government to be strong and united. Grévy was forced to retire in 1887 on account of family troubles. His son-in-law, one of the deputies, was accused of dishonest dealing in decorations, Grévy could get no one to join him in a ministry after this scandal, and had to retire.

Gambetta was the real force of the time. When Macmahon resigned Gambetta became president of the Chamber of Deputies. His personality towered above all the other men of his time ; he should have had a more prominent post in the government, but Grévy was afraid of him. Gambetta's *occult power* was really the guiding power, but Grévy saw in him ominous portents of a dictator and so kept him in the background as long as he could. But he was powerless to stifle Gambetta's influence. In 1881 Grévy could no longer pass him over and he became prime minister, an office which he held unfortunately only for a few weeks, dying in 1882 as the result of an accident. His ministry was called the "great ministry" as a term of derision by those who resented his domination. It was composed of the party who favoured his views, but Gambetta, by his natural forcefulness and masterful ways, had alienated the more moderate republicans from him ; they were afraid to commit themselves to such lengths as they feared he would go ; they were jealous of his powers. Gambetta was only forty-four when he died ; his death was a signal for great manifestations of outward mourning by those politicians who in life had known how to thwart and stand in the way of this great man, the outstanding figure of the

early days of the third republic. The two chief features of Gambetta's policy were his uncompromising warfare against clericalism and his efforts to build up an international league against Germany. The opportunists continued after his death to be the powerful party, but the majorities were so slender that changes in the cabinet and in the ministry were many and followed each other in quick succession.

From 1887 to 1889 a movement against the republic was organised by General Boulanger. He had served France in the Franco-Prussian war; he had taken part in the siege of Metz, whence he had escaped to take part in the siege of Paris. Afterwards he had fought in Algeria and Cochin China. He had been Minister for War in the Freycinet cabinet (1880), but his extreme democracy and his uncompromising ways had led to his forced retirement from that office. He then set about forming a party of his own. His plan was to overthrow the government and substitute for the existing republic a republic more directly governed by the people. He had a great following in the country; the romance of his military exploits, his dashing personality, handsome appearance, and attractive ways made him the idol of the people. He asserted that it was "better to die fighting, that to accept the never-ending sequence of affronts and insults" to which Germany subjected France. He had caught the popular fancy and the more extreme republicans flocked to his banner, as well as those monarchists who held that any change which would overthrow the government might result in their favour. But Boulanger was a creature of impulse, he had no genius for taking pains, he had not sufficient weight to carry through his plan; and with the people behind him, he could easily have overthrown the weak and vacillating government of that time had he organised and persisted in his effort. With all his faults it is impossible not to feel a certain admiration for this picturesque figure—*le brave Général*, beloved of Paris, who returned him to the chamber by an overwhelming majority—whose impetuous ways led him to challenge the prime minister (M. Floquet) to a duel, and who, when fortune had ceased to smile upon him, committed suicide in a cemetery.

The chief measure of Grévy's presidency which calls for mention was that of 1885 excluding members of any royal house which had ruled in France from military or civil positions in the country.

Grévy was succeeded by Sadi Carnot in 1887. Carnot was a

member of the third generation of a family distinguished in the political history of France. His grandfather, General Carnot, had been a member of the national convention; his father was Minister of Public Instruction, but disappeared from public life on his refusal to take the oath of allegiance to Napoleon III. Carnot himself was Minister of Public Works and then of Finance before he became president in 1887. He was in office at the time of the great Paris Exhibition of 1889 when the Eiffel Tower first astonished the world. It was under Carnot's presidency, too, that the Panama scandals occurred. Carnot himself had set a fine example of honest and upright dealing before the republic, and it was to the great loss of the country that he was assassinated by an Italian anarchist in 1894.

The Panama Canal.—The Isthmus of Panama belonged to the republic of Colombia (or New Granada as it was till 1861 called), but that government signed an agreement with a Frenchman, Bonaparte Wyse, giving him the right to construct a canal from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean. Ferdinand de Lesseps, the designer of the Suez Canal, had completed the designs for this project in 1879, and a huge company was formed, backed by an enormous capital, subscribed largely by the small French peasant class and the bourgeoisie. This company had armies of workmen and a tremendous equipment of machinery. The canal was begun at both ends simultaneously in 1881. But after several years' work, owing to mismanagement, extravagance, and fraudulent proceedings, the company became bankrupt in 1888. Thousands of working-class families saw their savings, laboriously gathered by years of toil and frugal living, swept away; savings on which they had hoped to spend the tranquil years of their old age. Many parliamentary men were involved in this scandal, which caused a tremendous upheaval of distress and indignation in France, and after which the political life of the country lay for some years under a deep shadow. After long negotiations the United States bought the concessions, the plans, and the work already done from France for £8,000,000: they had also to treat with the government of Colombia for the strip of land across the isthmus through which the canal was to be cut. Many delays occurred, the mosquito was the greatest obstacle—in fact its elimination was the one thing which made the canal possible—but the last land barrier was cut down on October 10, 1913; an explosion of dynamite which broke through this last obstruction was fired from the White House, Washington, by President Wilson depressing a telegraph key. The first steamer passed

through the canal on November 17, 1913, and on August 1, 1914 the first ocean-going steamship made the voyage.

The Dreyfus Case: The Law of Separation.—Casimir-Perrier who succeeded Carnot, was the candidate of the moderate party He had left the chamber at the time of the passing of the law against members of the royal families of France holding civil or military positions, and he was therefore suspected for a time of royalist tendencies. But he was returned by the moderate party and occupied the president's chair for nearly a year when he retired. The country was surprised and disappointed, for he was a fine man and lent dignity and strength to the government. He had been bitterly attacked by the socialists, and explained his resignation on the grounds that the president had to shoulder grave responsibilities and that he was not given sufficient power to enable him to discharge these responsibilities in an adequate way.

He was succeeded by Felix Faure, who died four years later. It fell to him to receive the czar in Paris in 1896—the first visit of a ruling sovereign to the republic. Faure returned the visit in the following year, when by his tact and diplomacy he was able to bring to a successful issue the negotiations for a treaty between Russia and France.

The chief event of this period, an event which, though small in itself, had far-reaching consequences, embroiled the whole forces of France, and excited the attention of the world, was the Dreyfus case. The facts were briefly these. Captain Alfred Dreyfus while attending a course at the Staff College in Paris was accused in 1894 of offering to Germany a document containing secret information. His guilt or innocence turned entirely on this one document which was known as the *bordereau*. It was examined by experts who could come to no unanimous finding as to whether it was in the handwriting of Dreyfus or not. But Dreyfus was unpopular ; he was a Jew. He was found guilty and sentenced to degradation and imprisonment for life. After his degradation with all its humiliations had been duly carried out, Dreyfus was sent to the Devil's Island to work out his life sentence. But six months later Colonel Picquart became head of the Intelligence Department. He soon found that the enemy was still receiving military secrets from France. Major Esterhazy was now accused, not only of having sold secrets to Germany, but of having forged the *bordereau* whereby Dreyfus had been convicted. Esterhazy was tried in 1898 and acquitted. The government did not wish the question opened up again, and

they sent Colonel Picquart abroad. But some influential men had begun to doubt the guilt of Dreyfus and to see in all this some deeply designed plot. Among the champions of Dreyfus were such big men as Clemenceau, Jaurés, Reinach, Zola, and many more. Zola threw himself heart and soul into the matter, and wrote several pamphlets which were widely circulated in France and other countries. He was arrested for libel, and sentenced to a year's imprisonment. But by that time he had already left France and found sanctuary in England. Six months passed. Then Colonel Henry, the new chief of the Intelligence Department, confessed that he had forged the documents which had strengthened the case against Dreyfus. The following day Paris heard that he had shot himself. The Minister for War, Cavaignac, who had been implicated in the case, resigned his office. It was now clearly evident that something more than the trial of a captain for treachery was at the root of all this. In 1898 Dreyfus was brought back to France for a fresh trial. There was some delay before it commenced. Faure was said to be against Dreyfus; he died and President Loubet was elected in his stead, because it was thought that he favoured a speedy settlement of the agitation. When it became known that he thought Dreyfus ought to be set free, he was at once accused of all sorts of infamies, that he was in the pay of the Jews, and so on; France was in a state of hysterical excitement, feeling ran high, and each party would believe any evil thing of the other. Dreyfus was tried at Rennes; the trial lasted for a month, and the least that can be said of it is that it was not creditable to the officers concerned. Dreyfus was again found guilty and this time he was sentenced to ten years' imprisonment. Ten days later he was formally acquitted by the president. The case was finally brought up before a Court of Cassation a year later, and the innocence of Captain Dreyfus was established by law, although neither he nor Colonel Picquart was fully reinstated in the army for seven years (July 13, 1906).

Dreyfus was a Jew and the affair was explained by the growth of the anti-semitic party in France. This anti-semitic agitation was due in some degree to the part played by Jewish financiers in the Panama scandal. Then the clerical party had come to exercise great power in France, and it had been led to believe that the anti-clerical policy of the government was incited by the Jews. More than that, it was asserted that the Jews exerted a powerful influence over the army and that they were attempting to make the military secrets of France known to their

co-religionists in Germany. The Dreyfus affair was used by all parties against its opponents; the opposition blamed the government, the Church blamed the anti-clerical party, the anti-clerical party blamed the Church, and the socialists blamed the military. It was after the Dreyfus affair that the government began to take severe disciplinary measures against clericalism and the religious orders, which had come to exercise a great influence on the country. This policy was initiated by Waldeck-Rousseau, one of the strongest prime ministers France has had, he was a disciple of Gambetta, but he did not foresee to what extremes his policy was to be carried. When he retired in 1902 he was succeeded by M. Combes, who in early life had been a priest of the French Catholic Church, but who was now bitterly opposed to it; his antipathy to the Church and all things savouring of clericalism was almost an obsession, he could not touch any question without giving it an anti-clerical bias, and he openly declared that he had only assumed the premiership in order to be able to legislate against the Church. He dissolved all religious orders which refused to render to the government a complete account of their laws and their finances. This soon led to discord with the Vatican. Pius X. objected to President Loubet's visit to the King of Italy on the ground that the ruler of France, bound by the concordat of the great Napoleon to the See of Rome, should not visit the "person" who, according to the pope, illegally exercised the rights of a sovereign in Rome. But the French government was not inclined to give in; instead it recalled the representative of France from the papal court. In 1905 the *Law of Separation* was brought forward by Aristide Briand, the Minister of Public Worship. It provided that the state should no longer have a state religion; that no religious body was to be officially recognised, but it also promised facilities for the free practice of public worship, and assured freedom of conscience to all the citizens of France; and it provided a system of pensions for aged and infirm priests. Rather than allow the French Catholics to submit to certain regulations of the French government, which provided that all ecclesiastical buildings should be under the jurisdiction of "association of public worship," the pope allowed the property of the Catholic Church in France to fall away from it, which led to the necessity of many religious bodies leaving the country. Not, in most cases, because the government forced them to go, but because of the pope's determination that this government of France which had trodden the concordat under foot should not be obeyed in any respect.

Pius X. overrode the wishes of the French Catholic Church, forbidding it to come to terms with the French government. Thus the Catholic Church has no legal status in France, receives no support from the state, and has no privileges. But this outward schism does not seriously interfere with the inward life of the Church. That is in some ways more fundamentally threatened by the free-thought party. Unity of spirit may one day conquer and heal these grievous divisions.

Increasingly Friendly Relations between England and France: Fashoda: The Entente Cordiale.—Since 1873 and 1875, when the Prince of Wales (afterwards King Edward VII.) and Queen Victoria had intervened between France and Germany, relations had become increasingly friendly between the two countries. An agreement had been arrived at in 1898 about Nigerian territory, and in Egypt England and France had to work together to subdue their common adversary, the Khedive. Their interests met all over the globe in connection with their colonies—the French colonial empire is only second to the British—and it was always possible to arrange matters amicably between them. But when the Fashoda incident occurred in 1898 relations were uncomfortably strained for a short time. It happened in this wise.

A French officer, Major Marchand, had been ordered to extend French influence on the Nile, where the English seemed to be acting beyond an agreement they had come to with France. Marchand arrived at Fashoda, a small and unimportant village on the White Nile, with five other Europeans and a body of Senegalese troops. Marchand hoisted the tricolour. Now General Kitchener, then Sirdar of Egypt, had just completed the series of operations which culminated in the taking of Omdurman. He heard of Marchand's being at Fashoda and at once set off to investigate matters. He arrived and caused the Egyptian flag to be hoisted; negotiations were at once entered on between England and France. Kitchener declared that he was opposed to the French holding any territory in that district. The English ultimately insisted on the withdrawal of the French troops, and Marchand was recalled to Europe. Fashoda has now ceased to exist; its name was changed to Kodok in order that the whole incident might be forgotten.

In 1903 King Edward visited M. Loubet in Paris, and a month later, M. Loubet and M. Delcassé, Minister for Foreign Affairs, went over to London to arrange about an agreement with England concerning mutual interests in Egypt, Morocco, Terra-Novo, South Africa, Siam, Madagascar, and the

New Hebrides. This *Treaty of London* (1904) was virtually the beginning of the *Entente Cordiale* of which King Edward was the moving spirit. He again visited M. Loubet in Paris in 1905, and the *Entente Cordiale* has since been one of the chief features of the foreign policy of France. A meeting of the Algeciras Conference in 1906, under the presidency of M. Fallières, consolidated still further the good feeling between France and England. The agreement of that time led to treaties between France, England, Spain, and Russia. One of the points arranged was that the policing of Moroccan waters should be entrusted to Spanish and French fleets, a point which was afterwards to be brought up in connection with the Agadir incident. A convention of 1906 between England, Italy, and France on railway questions led to an understanding between these countries. All these agreements showing the friendly feeling of other nations towards France gave Germany considerable annoyance.

Relations between France and Germany: The Agadir Incident. —There were even in France some optimistic spirits who declared, like their British *confrères*, that war would never come again, that war on a large scale was impossible in these days of modern armaments and scientific inventions. And yet in other parts of the world wars followed each other in quick succession —China and Japan, Turkey and Greece, Spain and the United States of America, Great Britain and South Africa, Russia and Japan. Germany was visibly annoyed at the growing friendship between France and England which had been firmly cemented and publicly declared by the Treaty of London in 1904. From 1905 till 1911 there was constant friction between France and Germany in connection with the interests of both countries in Morocco. France had decidedly the larger share of these interests. In 1905, the emperor was displeased because M. Delcassé, the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, had concluded treaties with Spain and England, relative to Morocco, without consulting Germany. France had also treaties with Russia and Italy, and Germany felt she was being left out. The emperor demanded compensation and the resignation of M. Delcassé. This demand was granted, and M. Delcassé was sacrificed in the interests of peace. In February, 1909, Germany could not but recognise the right of French domination in questions regarding Morocco, and an agreement was signed between France and Germany. But in 1911 came the Agadir incident of sinister foreboding.

The tribes had risen and besieged Fez, the headquarters of French military power and the residence of the European consuls. Reinforcements were sent from western Morocco under General Moinier, who after many skirmishes succeeded in entering Fez on May 21. Now the policing of these waters, as we have seen, had long before been entrusted to the French and Spanish fleets, and the French had given assurances that their action in this affair was only to safeguard the Europeans and that no alteration in the political balance of power in Morocco was intended. They had the situation well in hand when, to their astonishment and the astonishment of the world, the German gunboat *Panther* steamed into the "closed" port of Agadir on July 1 in defiance of the French and in order, so Germany said, "to safeguard the persons and property of German subjects." But there were no German subjects at Agadir, and Kiderlen-Waechter, the German Minister for Foreign Affairs, had himself declared in the Reichstag that closed ports could only be opened by the sultan acting in agreement with the other treaty powers. Germany evidently wished to reduce French domination in Morocco. When the *Panther* left, her place was taken by the armed cruiser *Berlin*, a much more formidable vessel. There was at once grave tension between the two countries; war seemed inevitable. France appealed to Russia and to England who promised to defend her rights of treaty. Mr. Asquith declared in the House of Commons that he was "confident diplomatic discussion would find a solution and that in the part Great Britain would take in it she would have due regard to the protection of British interests and the fulfilment of her treaty obligations with France." Germany evidently wanted to claim compensation in order to make her interests in Morocco equal to those of France. Negotiations between M. Jules Cambon, French ambassador at the court of Berlin, and Herr von Kiderlen-Waechter seemed fruitless. France could not agree to the preposterous demands of Germany. Mr. Asquith said that the British government had made it quite clear that failing a settlement, "honourable and satisfactory to both parties, Great Britain must become an active party to the discussion of the situation, in fulfilment of her pledges to France in the Treaty of Algeciras and the agreement of 1904 and in defence of British interests." Mr. Balfour spoke on behalf of the Opposition, saying that if there were "any who supposed that Great Britain was wiped out of the map of Europe because she had her own differences at home, it might be worth while saying, for the benefit of those whom it might

concern, that they had utterly mistaken the temper of the British people and the patriotism of the opposition."[1] These declarations of Mr. Asquith and Mr. Balfour gave rise to tension between Germany and England. But by the end of August, France and Germany had agreed on terms of settlement; Germany to receive compensation in the French Congo. These treaties were signed in Berlin on November 4, and the *Berlin* left Agadir on November 27.

It has been truly said that whereas other nations are states with armies behind them, Germany is an army with a state behind it. There can be no doubt, even in the minds of the most charitable, that Germany was looking for war with France in 1905, that she deliberately asked for it in 1911 by the Agadir incident, that she only postponed it until her carefully laid plans should be further advanced, till Europe presented more favourable opportunities for the acquisition of world-power by the Hohenzollerns. Kiderlen-Waechter was a disciple of Bismarck. His attempts against France only served to consolidate the French nation and to increase its preparations and its vigilance.

The Colonial Empire of France.—France had to provide an outlet for her capital and the produce of her industry; some of her politicians, notably Jules Ferry, saw in colonial expansion the most direct path for France to regain her place among the great European powers. In the last thirty-five years her colonial empire has expanded to an enormous extent. In the vast territories she now possesses outside of France she rules over more than 54,000,000 people; her colonial empire is second largest in the world, coming after that of Great Britain. Since the Franco-Prussian War she has added to her colonies by the conquest of Tunis (1881), Tongking (1885), Madagascar (1895), Dahomey and the Ivory Coast (1887), French Congo (1893). Ferry was her greatest pioneer of colonial expansion; another was M. Doumer, who was made governor-general of Indo-China in 1896; his great administrative powers soon put the French colonies of that continent on a sound footing. In 1890 England and France signed a treaty assigning Madagascar and the "light soil" of the Sahara to France.

The French colonies at the present day are:—

In *Africa:* Algeria, which forms a protectorate under a governor-general; Tunis, Morocco, French West Africa includ-

[1] These extracts from speeches in the House of Commons are taken from the reports in the *Times*.

ing Senegal, French Guinea, the Ivory Coast, Dahomey, the Algerian Sahara, French Congo, French East Africa (including Madagascar and Somaliland), Kerguelen, Réunion, St. Paul, and Amsterdam.

In *Asia:* Cochin China, Annam (which was formed into a protectorate in 1885), Tongking, Laos, and Cambodia, also French India (including Pondicherry, Mahé, Karikal, Chandernagore), and Kwang-Chow-Wan.

In *Australasia* or *Oceania:* The Society Islands and New Caledonia,

In *America:* Martinique, Guadeloupe, and some smaller islands in the West Indies; Cayenne or French Guiana in South America, and some islands off Newfoundland, St. Pierre, Miquelon, etc.

The French colonies are represented in the Chamber by ten deputies and in the Senate by four senators.

Education.—One of the greatest figures in the educational history of France is Victor Duruy (1811–1894). He was for a time professor of history at the *École Polytechnique* and became Minister for Public Instruction in 1863, when Napoleon III. wrote to him: "Continue to share with me the sacred fire of inspiration for all that is great and noble." In 1867 he presented to the Senate a project for the reorganisation of higher education in the state schools and he demanded free and compulsory education of children from six to thirteen years of age, a measure which, though it was not passed at that time, came into force in 1880 under Jules Ferry. Duruy demanded also that the scholars of the lycées, local colleges, and normal schools should be instructed in the use of firearms, that they should undergo sufficient military training to enable them to be formed quickly into a national *garde mobile*, but this measure, which he advocated along with Marshal Niel, was not carried out.

Duruy also instituted evening classes for adults and lectures on subjects of general interest in the country districts. Altogether he accomplished a great work for the opening up of France to educational enlightenment. He was in power only for six years, a movement against him, instigated by the clerical party who objected to his anti-clerical influence on the schools, drove him from office just before the republic, when under a liberal government he could have carried with ease those reforms which it was the ambition of his life to realise. Owing to the falling birthrate, one of the problems of modern France, Duruy in his

first official address to the University of Paris demanded that the university should make men, not bachelors.

Jules Ferry succeeded Duruy as Minister of Public Instruction and carried on the educational reforms of the republic. But the problem of education in France, as of all public affairs in that country, was the difficulty between the state and the Church. The state schools were the schools of the country, and even though the Catholics did not wish to send their children to them, they had to pay for the upkeep of these schools and so in the majority of cases were obliged to use them. (There were, of course, private Catholic schools as well, though religious orders could no longer engage in teaching after the Separation Law of 1904, and every private school, however small, had to be approved and licensed by the government.) The difficulty was that what the children were taught in the state schools, the way they were taught, the books from which they learnt, all these were often taken exception to by the Catholic parents, and were a constant source of friction between teachers and parents. It must not for a moment be supposed that the schools showed an anti-religious tendency ; the quarrel was with the policy of the Church, not with Christianity. As one of the greatest men of modern France, M. Clemenceau, has said, " Even if we cannot have faith in the Church, we need not despair. We must devote our lives to alleviating distress and to helping others. This course will slay the demon of evil and enrich our own souls."

France is liberally supplied with schools under a comprehensive system of government. The country is divided into sixteen districts or *académies* as they are called, with a local university as the headquarters of educational affairs for each district. The sixteen districts, which each comprise two or three departments, are Paris, Aix, Besançon, Bordeaux, Caen, Chambéry, Clermont-Ferrand, Dijon, Grenoble, Lille, Lyons, Montpellier, Nancy, Poitiers, Rennes, and Toulouse. Education is good and cheap, and the salaries of the teachers have lately been raised, though they do not yet equal the salaries paid in England or Germany.

Education begins at an early age in France ; children from two to six years are received in the *écoles maternelles*. These preparatory schools are followed by the primary elementary schools taking children of from six to thirteen years, and higher primary schools, which offer technical education and instruction in the higher branches of learning. After the elementary schools come the secondary schools, which comprise the lycées, local universities or colleges, and private schools. The University of

France, which is composed of colleges in different parts of the country, grants degrees in five faculties, letters, medicine, law, Protestant theology, and science. The Catholic clergy of France are forbidden to attend civil universities. The Sorbonne attracts to itself more than half of all the students of France; it has more than 100 professorial chairs, more than 17,000 students. For advanced students there are also the Collège de France, the Natural History Museum, the schools of fine arts, of engineering, of modern oriental languages, of scientific research, of political science, the Conservatoire, and three state astronomical institutions. The *Institute de France* for the prosecution of the higher branches of science and literature consists of five *académies*, the *Académie Française*, the *Académie des Beaux-Arts*, the *Académie des Sciences*, the *Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques*, and the *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*. These are select bodies and have comparatively few members, only the authorities on the various subjects. There is also an *Académie de Medicine* on similar lines, but it is not connected with the institute.

Literature in the Latter Part of the Nineteenth Century.—The period we have to consider, the latter part of the nineteenth century, saw the last days of a great band of contemporary writers. Of the chief of these, Balzac, Victor Hugo, Alexandre Dumas, and George Sand, it might be a fair generalisation to say that they were famous for what they wrote, while those who came after them were more celebrated for how they wrote.

Balzac (1799–1850) had already passed away at the height of his powers, leaving behind him an immense literary output for a man who had died at the age of fifty-one. The history of his struggles should prove encouraging to young writers, for he had written more than twenty novels before he achieved any success. "If I have not genius," he declared, "it is all up with me," and after he found his *métier* he wrote with the utmost enthusiasm, showering forth his novels one after the other in extraordinary profusion, the mere quantity of his work was in itself amazing. His novels cover the whole life of modern France and are classified as the *Comédie Humaine; Scènes de la Vie de Province; de la Vie Politique; de la Vie Parisienne; de la Vie Militaire; de la Vie de Campagne; Études Philosophiques; Études Analytiques*, and so on. He had a vivid imagination and his characters stand out in bold relief, drawn in strong, rapid strokes. But the characters he created were real men and women. His greatest

books were *Père Goriot, La Peau de Chagrin, Eugénie Grandet,* and *Les Parents Pauvres.*

Victor Hugo's greatest days were already past (1802–1885). He had been exiled for attempting to stir up a rising against Napoleon III.; *Napoléon le Petit,* as he called him in the famous pamphlet attacking him. Hugo only returned to France after the declaration of the third republic; he wrote a volume of verse about the experiences of Paris during the siege, *L'Année Terrible,* interesting because of its light on the subject, but not approaching his best work. He began his career as a poet, then he turned to dramatic writing, his most important plays being *Cromwell, Hernani, Marion Delorme,* and *Ruy Blas.* In the first bitterness of his exile he wrote satires, *Les Châtiments* is a work of this nature; then in his enforced leisure he took up the study of history and produced his great historical study, *La Légende des Siècles,* which is often considered his greatest work. His poetry is finer than his prose, but his novels *Les Misérables* and *Notre-Dame de Paris* are great books, probably as much read to-day as when they were written, and as much in England as in France. Hugo is regarded as the writer who has carried the grand manner of French literature down nearly to the end of the nineteenth century. "This man who was acquainted with all the existing resources of style, language, and rhythm, and who created some for himself, will always appear a marvel as long as the French language exists." [1]

Alexandre Dumas (1802–1870) is said to have modelled his novels on those of Sir Walter Scott. He was a great-hearted, irresponsible, impulsive man, as well as a great genius, and his novels, based on historical plots, are still as eagerly read on this side of the Channel as in France. He was greater even as a playwright than as a novelist; his chief plays are *Charles VII. chez ses Grands Vassaux, La Tour de Nesles, Henry III.,* and *Caligula.* Dumas took an active part in the troublous days of the overthrow of the Bourbons, and when the disasters of 1870 fell upon France he lost his reason and died in a few weeks. His adopted son, Dumas fils, made his first hit with a novel, *La Dame aux Camélias,* but afterwards devoted himself to writing for the stage. His chief plays were *Le Père Prodigue, Alphonse,* and *La Visite des Noces,* etc. Other dramatists were Victorien Sardou and Rostand, who wrote *Cyrano de Bergerac.*

George Sand (1804–1876) was one of the greatest women novelists of the world. Her real name was Aurore Dudevant;

[1] Emile Faguet, *Literary History of France.*

she married young, but after nine years of unhappiness procured a separation from her husband. She and Alfred de Musset met some years later and had a short but violent friendship, after which she wrote several novels on the theme of unrequited affection. Her letters to him were published in 1897. She was an extraordinarily prolific writer, producing often three or four novels in one year. She wrote in three distinct styles; romantic at first, her mind was afterwards dominated by political ideas, and she finally turned to themes connected with the country life of France. She was a true lover of nature; she had been brought up in the country, and is at her best in descriptions of rustic life, to which she brought a warm heart and a charming style. These novels have been described as "genuine epic poems." The most famous are *Lélia, La Petite Fadette, Consuelo, Elle et Lui, Le Marquis de Villemer.*

We now come to those writers who, while not pouring out such an enormous amount of matter, laid more stress on style and produced nothing but finished work. This is of course a generalisation; there are exceptions on both sides. These later writers seem to lack something of the grand manner, the generosity and warm-hearted impulsiveness of their forerunners.

Théophile Gautier (1811–1872) is easily the first. Though he began his literary life as a poet—"the most perfect poet in point of form that France has produced"—he is also celebrated as a writer of prose. His work is very perfect; his aim was not to part from anything he wrote till he had polished it to the highest point of perfection possible to him, that it might leave his hands as an exquisite cameo. (One of his volumes of verse he called *Émaux et Camées.*) Gautier was at his best in short pieces in which the beauty of style and finished workmanship are unsurpassed. His chief novels are *Mademoiselle de Maupin, Le Capitaine Fracasse, Les Jeunes Frances,* and the *Paradis des Chats.* Besides poetry, fiction, and archæological novels, Gautier wrote a long series of books on the history and criticism of art.

Pierre Loti (born in 1850), whose real name is Jules Viaud, was an officer in the French navy. His calling took him all over the globe and his writings are unconsciously a tribute to the colonial expansion of France, for they deal with Senegal, Morocco, Tahiti, and so on. Loti possesses the power of putting himself for the time being in the place of those he writes about; whether he writes of peasants, of fishermen, of the bourgeoisie, he adopts their point of view, their nature as his own and writes, as it were, from within their consciousness. He exercises the

highest form of art, for his descriptions are not mere photographic reproductions ; they are enriched by the impress of the mind. His most popular books are *Le Roman d'un Spahi*, *Le Pêcheur d'Islande*, *Le Roman d'un Enfant*, *Japonneries d'Automne*, *Le Désert*, and *Le Galilée*.

Emile Zola (1840–1902) belongs to the realist school. His books are more powerful than pleasant and fall within the category described in England as novels with a purpose. "He had strength," says M. Faguet, "he gave in every volume he wrote the impression of enormous effort and of a vigour consciously equal to the task in hand. He had talents peculiar to himself ; he was able to convey the impression of a whole, of a town, of a coal-field, of a limitless plain, especially of crowds—the stir, the roar, the excitement of the mob swept along by waves of emotion, and carried away by sudden terror." [1] His chief books are *Rome*, *Lourdes*, *L'Assomoir*, *Fécondité*, *Travail*, *Germinal*, and *Le Débâcle*.

Of other modern writers we have only space to mention Edouard and Jules de Goncourt (1822–1896 and 1830–1870) ; Fromentin (1820–1876), who wrote *L'Été dans le Sahara* and *Année dans le Sahel ;* Flaubert (1821–1880), who wrote in two distinct styles, romantic and realistic, the one style alternating with the other in his literary output, and who was a "fanatic in matter of form." His best-known novel was *Madame Bovary*, but he wrote many books on archæological, mediæval, and oriental subjects, as well as novels on the most trivial topics of everyday life ; Alphonse Daudet (1840–1879), the French Dickens, whose wife, son, and brothers were also writers of distinction ; Feuillet (1821–1890), who was at first a follower of Alexandre Dumas, but afterwards came to write on modern social life, whose best-known book is the *Roman d'un Jeune Homme Pauvre ;* Prosper Mérimée (1803–1871), who wrote historical novels as well as romances ; Paul Bourget (born 1852), poet, critic, and novelist, who is best known for his descriptions of his travels, and of these for his *Outre-mer*, dealing with his sojourn in America. The Erckmann-Chatrian partnership was an interesting one. Erckmann was a lawyer, while Chatrian was a glass-blower of Lorraine who became a teacher and then a clerk in a railway office. They wrote chiefly of the campaigns of Napoleon the Great, tales which transport the reader to the hills and valleys of Alsace and Lorraine. *L'Histoire d'un Conscrit* and *L'Ami Fritz* are best known in this country ; they are largely used as school books from the sim-

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 618.

plicity and clearness of their style. Gaboriau (1835-1873) was the French Sherlock Holmes of his day, and Cherbuliez (1829-1899), who was an extraordinarily learned man, is chiefly read on account of the learning diffused through his books. Guy de Maupassant (1850-1893), a disciple of Flaubert, is a writer who reflects all that he meets with in life as in a mirror. He wrote chiefly slight short stories and his charm lies in the extreme simplicity and beauty of his style and the true unadorned picture of everyday life which he gives us. His chief books are *Boule de Suif, Mademoiselle Fifi, Yvette, La petite Roque, Bel-Ami, Fort comme la Mort,* and *Une Vie.* Coming down to our own time, Anatole France is probably more read in England at the present day than any other French writer. He grew up among books, for his father kept a book-shop on one of the Quays of Paris, and the indescribable sense of the book-lover is discernible in his writing. Even in his lifetime the work of Anatole France is recognised to possess that touch of greatness which makes the classic. "Anatole France," says M. Faguet, "devotes his talent to making us share his own deep and exquisite delight in art in all its forms. An artistic sensation is to him a tangible thing to be handled, kneaded, perfected, refined, and finally presented to us in the frame or setting calculated to insure our acceptance and admiration of it." His chief works are *Le Crime de Sylvestre Bonnard, Thais, La Rôtisserie de la reine Pédauque, Le Lys Rouge, L'Ile des Pengouins* (a satire on the Dreyfus case), and *Les Dieux ont Soif.* Of the poets we can only mention the names, Leconte de Lisle, Sully-Prudhomme, François Coppée, Beaudelaire, Eugène Manuel, Jean Richepin, José-Maria de Heredia, Paul Verlaine, and of course several of the writers we have dealt with above, Victor Hugo, Gautier, Bourget, and Anatole France.

France has had many great historians in late years. Thierry, the historian of Merovingian times, whose work has been freely quoted in the first volume of this book; Thiers the statesman, whose *Histoire de la Revolution Française* and *Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire* are first authorities; Victor Duruy, whose *Histoirè Grecque* and *Histoire Romaine* are written in the same vivid enthusiastic style as this *History of France;* Michelet, who wrote a complete *History of France* as well as monographs on particular periods, and who wrote in a style peculiarly his own, making history live again for his readers; Lamartine, who wrote the *Histoire des Girondins;* Auguste Molinier, *Sources de l'Histoire de France;* Lavisse, *L'Histoire de la France;* Taine (1828–1893), who wrote philosophical histories, *Histoire de la*

Littérature Anglaise, Les Origines de la France Contemporaine, Essais de Critique et d'Histoire.

Renan's work was great not only for its scholarship, for the setting forth through his delicate perception and fine historical acumen of the *Histoire du Peuple d'Israel,* and of the *Histoire des Origines du Christianisme;* he was also the writer of the finest prose of the nineteenth century ; even those who disagree with his thought and his conclusions cannot fail to fall under the charm and beauty of his style. His *Vie de Jésus* (a part of his *History of the Origins of Christianity*) raised a storm of indignation not only among the clerical party in France but among the ultra-orthodox all over the world. But it was welcomed by the younger and more thoughtful republicans who saw in it a Christianity freed from political motives, a Christianity to which they could subscribe.

Theology and Philosophy.—In theology the modernist movement has been the most important tendency of recent years. Alfred Loisy, the leader of this movement, Professor of History of Religion at the Collège de France, is a scholar to whom nothing but the truth is of importance ; his companion the Abbé Bourier held and preached that the essential of religion was not to be a Catholic or a Protestant, but to be a Christian—" Where Christ is there is the Church." Some French theologians hold that the salvation of France is to be found in a " fusion of Catholic religion with Protestant thought " ; others, notably Germain-Levy, advocate a liberal judaism ; others again, Monod, Gounel, and the *Avant-Garde,* believe in an orthodox Protestantism ; others, like Sabatier, see in a new Catholicism the only hope for the religious life of France. Catholics and Protestants alike are eagerly pushing forward : to the outsider their aims seem to lie very near one another. Among the great theologians of recent years are Réville, Frommel, Dufourcq, Foucart, Jacquier, Laberthonnière, Le Roy ; the Church historians are Duchesne, Luchaire, Bremond ; Delacroix writes on mysticism. In philosophy the great names are Renouvier, Hannequin, Sertillanges, H. Poincaré, Simon, Janet, Boutroux, and Bergson, the prophet of idealism.

Music.—Modern France has already given the world classics in music, Berlioz, Gounod, César Franck, and Saint-Saëns have written works that will endure. Other famous composers are David, Bizet, Brassin, Massenet, Chaminade, Godard, Ambroise Thomas, Delibes, Carpentier, Debussy, César Franck's disciple Vincent d'Indy, Maurice Ravel, Widor, Roussel, and Guilmant. In music, as in the other arts, France seems in the last years to

have developed a more serious spirit, even while preserving that delicacy and charm peculiar to the French.

French Art after 1870.[1]—During the latter half of the nineteenth century, France was far ahead of the rest of Europe in the quality of her artistic output. Her schools of architecture, painting, and sculpture attracted students from other countries, and the honours awarded at her exhibitions were universally coveted. Yet her famous Barbizon school had scanty public recognition during the best working years of its members. The fame of Rousseau and Diaz (derived from our English Constable, Bonington, and the Norwich school) was chiefly posthumous, Millet died poor, Corot came to affluence when an old man.

Painters more in vogue were Courbet, Cabanel, Couture, Meissonier, Constant, Laurens, Boughereau, Roll, Henner, Breton, Duran, Baudry, Morot, occupied chiefly with classical and historical subjects, cultivating accurate drawing and strong light and shade somewhat at the expense of colour.

Later the plein-air and impressionist school claimed the chief interest. Cazin, Bastien-Lepage, Monet, Degas, Manet, Puvis de Chavannes, Renoir, and others. To many at this period the subject became of minor importance, colour decomposition, tonality, and manner of painting receiving the chief attention.

Recent painters have furnished a remarkable group of experimenters striving for a new technique and a fresh point of view. Pointellistes, Cubists, Vorticists, such artists as Signac, Gauguin, Denis, Bonnard, La Touche, Simon, and others have helped to maintain Paris in her place as the chief art centre.

Notable sculptors of the time are Carpeaux, Barye, Dalou, Fremiet, Bartholomé, Falguière, Rodin; it is no exaggeration to say that in sculpture France has latterly been without a rival.

Science and Invention.—Of modern French scientists, Pasteur must take the first place (1822–1895). By his vaccines he has been able to combat various diseases, his fame resting chiefly on the treatment he discovered for dealing with hydrophobia. Pasteur institutes to carry on his researches and beneficent labours have been established all over the world. And he has not only laboured for the well-being of the human race. He has attacked many problems of industrial life; at the request of the government he undertook researches into the silkworm disease which was causing serious loss to the silk industry of France. He was successful in discovering the cause and in checking it. Another great man, Elie Metchnikoff, although of Russian

[1] We are indebted to Charles Sims, R.A., for this note.

extraction, is a French citizen. He works in the Pasteur Institute at Paris trying to perfect his theory of prolonged life for those who will live according to his directions. He has been called the Apostle of Everlasting Life—not in the sense of Joachim de Fiore—but in the sense of this physical body. Madame Curie discovered radium in 1902: in physics Raoul Pictet and Louis Cailletet were the pioneers of modern methods in chemistry for liquefying gases; Becquerel of radio-activity. Among the great names in chemistry are Pierre Bertholet, Sabatier, and Henri Moisson, the pioneer of the electric furnace; in embryology, Yves Delage.

The French have shown their power of invention of recent years nowhere more than in their pioneering work in aviation. On July 25, 1909, M. Louis Bleriot made the first journey by aeroplane from France to England. He was also one of the foremost designers of aeroplanes, and the machine bearing his name was for long one of the chief types. In 1910 France employed aviation for the first time in her military manœuvres, and in 1911 French aviators flew from Paris to Madrid and from Paris to Rome. We have not space to go into all the miracles of French invention; enough has been said to show that in every branch of human activity France is in the advance-guard.

The Leaders of France in 1914.—President Loubet—the author along with King Edward of the *Entente Cordiale*—was succeeded by President Fallières, who held office till 1913, when M. Poincaré was elected. He had begun life as a lawyer and had already served France as Minister of Finance. He had seen the Prussians march through the streets of his home in 1870, and was in no doubt as to the necessity for France to keep herself strong and ready to prevent the recurrence of such a spectacle. It was during his presidency in 1914 that the Three Years' Service Bill came up. The Briand Cabinet had fallen over that and M. Barthou had become Prime Minister, determined to carry the Bill through. The chamber debated the measure for two months. Violent scenes occurred, but M. Poincaré, knowing the passing of the Bill to be of vital importance for France, threatened to dissolve the chamber if the Bill was interfered with in any way. In Raymond Poincaré France has a president of iron will; before he became Minister of Finance he had achieved the distinction of being the most successful lawyer at the French bar. Already he has made the office of president of the French Republic an office in which the president is indeed a power in the land, not merely a figurehead.

M. Théophile Delcassé is another great man. He was for many years Minister for Foreign Affairs and Colonial Minister, when he had to deal with the delicate Fashoda incident, and when he incurred the displeasure of the German emperor over the Moroccan question. Owing to the weakness of Rouvier, the Prime Minister of that time, Delcassé was sacrified to placate the German emperor. Delcassé then went to Russia as French ambassador. For a time he was at the Ministry of Marine, where he was associated with Admiral Boué de Lapeyrère, who had long been actively engaged in the reorganisation of the French navy and who commanded the French fleets at the outbreak of war in 1914, when M. Delcassé was Foreign Minister in the National Defence Ministry. The foreign policy of France owes much to M. Delcassé who so long presided over the destinies of the Foreign Office and who steered France through many shoals and shallow waters to bring her safe and strong to the great task which confronted her in 1914. Though in his foreign policy Delcassé was sometimes forced to come into conflict with British colonial policy, he has always been a good friend to England and has striven to strengthen the bonds which unite her to France.

M. Georges Clemenceau, politician, philosopher, novelist, and essayist, has had a varied career. Born in La Vendée, he went over to America as a young man and on his return he practised as a doctor in Montmartre before he entered political life. He was a disciple of Gambetta and was a great figure in the early days of the republic. Like Gambetta, even when he was not in office, he exercised enormous power behind the scenes. He was a born orator, and by the biting sarcasm of his invective and the irresistible power of his eloquence he was instrumental in overthrowing so many ministries that he became known as the *Tombeur des Ministères*. He began political life as a deputy in 1876; in 1893 he retired for some years from active political life and took to literature. He wrote on international affairs, on the affairs of France, and everything he touched he illumined with a flood of new light. He is a philosopher too with the broad-minded thought that seems characteristic of the France of to-day, and though he is far from being a churchman he is actuated by the highest ideals and his writings display a broad-minded and sincere feeling for the good of the world: Clemenceau's religion is altruism, "Let us make society profitable to us all," he says, "and not merely profitable to some."[1] In 1894 he took

[1] *La Mêlée Sociale.*

up the Dreyfus case and warmly championed the Jewish captain, whom he thought had been ill-treated. In March, 1906, he was called back to political life, being made Minister of the Interior, the first office he had held in all his long connection with the government. Always great as an orator, the "tiger" now dominated the ministry as by far the greatest figure in it. In October of the same year he became Prime Minister. He made Colonel Picquart Minister of War, not only as a recompense for his championship of Dreyfus, which had practically ruined his military career, but because of his administrative powers. From his earliest connection with political life, even before France and England had begun to draw together, Clemenceau had seen that the two countries must be friendly and had repeatedly used his great influence to that end.

Aristide Briand, famous as the promoter of the Separation Bill in 1905, has also been Prime Minister and is one of the great figures in French politics; he is a member of the National Defence Ministry, a socialist, a statesman, and a patriot, whose eloquence in debate is said to be irresistible.

Another great figure in French politics was Jean Jaurès, the socialist, who had been professor of philosophy before he went into politics; he enjoyed a cosmopolitan fame among socialists. He also was a great orator, and although no great policy can be attributed to him, yet he was for many years a force in the government of France. He was one of the victims, the first French victim, of the war; a man of unbalanced mind, agitated by the stress of the time and the excitement of the mobilisation, shot him in a Paris restaurant. The deed was meaningless, though attempts were made to give it political significance. But there was no longer any party in France, Socialist, Liberal, or Nationalist, all were united by the common danger, and no more earnest patriot than Jaurès ever served France.

Finally we come to Joffre, who was described for us by Lord Kitchener as not only a great general, but also a great man. Joffre had served in the siege of Paris in 1870; in 1914, he prevented the Germans from again entering his city. Joffre is a great figure—a simple, silent, kind-hearted man who has won the affection of his soldiers and the gratitude of the civilised world.

So much has been written about the period immediately before the outbreak of the war of 1914 that we need not go into it here. We have seen in these pages that it was inevitable. The moment

was probably chosen by Germany because she believed France to be water-logged financially. She may have hoped to break the Franco-Russian Alliance, thinking that France would hardly come into a war about an Austrian archduke ; thinking that after she had finished with Russia she could easily overrun France. For Germany never realised the stubborn defensive France was to offer, very different from that of the unprepared, unorganised, undisciplined army of 1870. Far less did Germany realise the strong offensive France was to assume. The Russian armies, it was well known, were not to be fully mobilised till 1917. Italy belonged to the Triple Alliance, England was on the brink of civil war over the Ulster problem. There are countless other reasons with which Germany no doubt assured herself that August, 1914, was the psychological moment for her to inaugurate her policy of world-power or downfall, for the testing once more of her barbaric formula of 1870, *Force comes before law*. But she had miscalculated, and nowhere more disastrously than in her estimate of the power of France.

One of the happiest reflections that comes from the study of French history is that of the reconciliation—after bitter and age-long enmity and warfare—of France and England, a reconciliation which was effected in time to allow of its being firmly cemented and established before these two countries took their stand shoulder to shoulder against the onslaughts of a common and barbarous foe.

Victor Duruy's words of exhortation to France in 1871 assume an almost prophetic significance in the light of the unity and strength of the France of to-day, and he supplied the answer. " How can the soul of the country be reanimated ? " he had asked. " By the firm determination to make men and citizens, by manfully and stoutly putting things in their proper places ; duty above law, responsibility beside liberty, discipline above all, discipline in the family, in the city, in the state."

INDEX

Abelard, i. 236
Abensberg, Battle of, ii. 422
Académie Française, ii. 112
Academies, the, ii. 206, 292, 543
Adalbero, Bishop, i. 7, 180, 188, 227
Adrets, Baron des, ii. 15
Aduatici, i. 52
Aedui, the, i. 48
Aegidius, i. 72
Aëtius, i. 71
Africa, Franks in, i. 68; Dieppe sailors in, 337; French colonies in, ii. 540
Agadir, ii. 538
Agincourt, Battle of, i. 351
Agnadello, Victory of, i. 462
Agriculture, i. 467, 514, ii. 75, 138, 230, 270, 293, 387, 496, 506, 530
Aides, the, i. 290, 335. *See* Taxation
Aistulf, King of the Lombards, i. 134
Aix or Aquæ Sextii, Battle of, i. 49
Aix-la-Chapelle, Council of, i. 153; Treaty of, ii. 245
Alais, Edict of, ii. 96
Alans, i. 69
Alaric I., i. 69
Alaric II., i. 81
Albigenses, crusade against the, i. 250
Albret, house of, i. 447; Jeanne d', 480
Alchemy, i. 273
Alcuin, the Anglo-Saxon, i. 149
Alemanni, i. 66, 68, 85, 131
Alençon, house of, i. 425; Dukes of, 301, 358
Alesia, i. 57
Alexander II., Czar, ii. 527
Alexander VI., Pope, i. 450
Alexander VII., Pope, ii. 152
Algeciras Conference, ii. 538, 539
Algiers, capture of, ii. 469
Alliance, the Holy, ii. 466; the Quadruple, 473; Triple, 530
Alsace, i. 420, ii. 107, 109, 160, 189, 510, 519
Amboise, George d', i. 468, 471; Conspiracy of, ii. 6; Peace and Edict of, 17
American War, the, ii. 287 *sqq.*
Amiens, surprise of, ii. 69; Peace and Treaty of, 386; rupture of, 392
Ancenis, Treaty of, i. 411
Ancona, occupation of, ii. 471
Andelot, Treaty of, i. 101, 108
Ango, Roger, i. 516
Anianus, St., i. 71
Anjou, house of, i. 185, 234; Dukes of, ii. 38
Anne of Austria, ii. 113
Anne of Beaujeu, i. 438 *sqq.*
Anne of England, Queen, ii. 181
Anselm, St., i. 202
Aquitaine, Conquest of, i. 51
Aquitanians, i. 131, 182
Aragon, Kings of, i. 256, 434, 447
Arbogast, i. 67, 69
Architecture, i. 203, 276, 517, ii. 144, 219
Armagnac, house of, i. 348, 353, 426
Army, i. 512, ii. 77, 201, 250, 266, 524
Arnulf of Metz, i. 120, 124, 126
Arques, Battle of, ii. 54
Arras, Treaty of, i. 377; Second Treaty of, 433
Artevelde, Jacob, i. 296; Philip, 339
Arts, the, i. 203, 276, 470, 515, 520, ii. 78, 144, 216, 230, 292, 417, 467, 496, 549
Assemblies, National, i. 143, ii. 303-327, 487; of Bordeaux, 520; of Versailles, 521; Legislative, ii. 328-335, 491; Constituent, ii. 307
Astrology, i. 273, ii. 543
Attalus, i. 88
Attila, i. 71
Aubin du Cormier, Battle of St., i. 445
Audefroy the Bastard, i. 274
Auerstadt, Battle of, ii. 407
Augereau, General, ii. 356, 364, 395, 411
Augsburg, League of, ii. 167; War of League of, 172
Augustinians, i. 277
Augustus, i. 59
Aumale, Battle of, ii. 59
Auray, Battle of, i. 325

Austerlitz, Battle of, ii. 401
Austrasians, i. 87, 96
Austria, House of, i. 430, 473, ii. 104, 238; Napoleon's wars against, 370, 401, 422 *sqq.*; Austrian army in France, 445; war in Italy against, 502
Avars, i. 96, 138
Averni, i. 48
Aviation, ii. 294, 550
Avignon, popes at, i. 286

Baden, Treaty of, ii. 193
Bagaudae, the, i. 66
Bailly, ii. 308, 313, 341
Baldwin Bras de Fer, i. 166
Balue, Cardinal la, i. 415
Balzac, Jean, ii. 207; Honoré de, ii. 543
Barbarian invasion, i. 2, 67 *sqq.*
Barnave, ii. 321
Barricades, Day of the, ii. 45, 121
Barrot, Odilon, ii. 476, 483
Barry, Countess du, ii. 257
Bart, Jean, i. 465; ii. 192
Bartholomew, Massacre of St., ii. 24
Bastille, the, ii. 309
Bathilda, Queen, i. 123
Bavaria, Elector of, ii. 184
Bavarians, i. 131
Bayard, i. 459 *sqq.*, 476, 483, 484
Bayonne, Conference of, ii. 18
Bazaine, Marshal, ii. 509, 516
Béarnais, The. *See* Henry IV.
Beaufort, Duke of, ii.
Beauharnais, General, ii. 346; Josephine, 373, 393, 428; Eugene, 418, 428
Beaujeu, house of, i. 438
Beauvais, resistance of, i. 418
Begga, i. 127
Bègue de Vilaines, Le, i. 323, 343
Belgae, i. 30, 65
Belgian Gaul, conquest of, i. 51
Belgium, ii. 471
Bellovaci, i. 58
Benedict of Anian, St., i. 146
Benedict of Nursia, St., i. 106, 277
Benedictine Order, i. 188
Benefices, i. 189, 190
Benevolent institutions, ii. 292, 495
Berengar of Tours, i. 202
Bergerac, Treaty of, ii. 36
Berlin, Decree of, ii. 400; Congress of, 528; Treaty of, 528
Bernadotte, ii. 372, 395, 404, 429, 441, 445
Bernard, St., i. 237; Preaches Second Crusade, 239
Bernard, King of Italy, i. 153
Bernhard Plantevelue, Count of Auvergne, i. 166
Berthaire, i. 125
Berthar, i. 93
Berri, assassination of Duke of, ii. 465; arrest of Duchess of, 473
Berry, Duke of, i. 339
Berthram, Bishop of Bordeaux, i. 114
Berwald, Treaty of, ii. 106
Berwick, Marshal, ii. 238
Bicocca, Battle of La, i. 483
Biron, Marshal, ii. 67, 289
Bishoprics, the Three, i. 501
Bishops, Rulers of Ancient Gaul, i. 104
Bismarck, ii. 513 *sqq.*, 528
Bituit, King of the Averni, i. 48
Bituriges, i. 55
Black Death, the, i. 304
Black Prince in France. *See* England
Blanche of Castille, regency of, i. 255
Blenheim, Battle of, ii. 185
Blois, Counts of, i. 185, 297; treaties of, 460; first states of, ii. 35; second states of, 46; ordinance of, 37
Bloody Week, the, ii. 521
Bohemia, ii. 239
Boii, i. 43
Boileau, Stephen, ii. 144
Bois-Guillebert, ii. 274
Bonaparte, Joseph II., ii. 394, 404, 418, 420; Louis II., 394, 404, 418; Elisa, 404; Pauline, 404; Caroline, 404; Jerome, 412, 418
Bonaparte, Louis Napoleon. *See* Napoleon III.
Bonaparte, Napoleon. *See* Napoleon I.
Bonapartists, ii. 515, 520
Boniface, St., i. 132
Boniface VIII., i. 283
Bordeaux, conquest of, i. 391; assembly of, 520
Bossuet, ii. 201, 208
Boufflers, Marshal, ii. 182
Bouille, Marquis de, ii. 290
Bouillon, Godfrey of, i. 217 *sqq.*
Boulanger, General, ii. 532
Boulogne, camp at, ii. 398
Bourbaki, General, ii. 518
Bourbon, constable, i. 483 *sqq.*; ministry of Duke of, ii. 232
Bourdonnais, La, ii. 244
Bouvines, victory of, i. 245
Breda, Treaty of, ii. 153

Brennville, defeat of, i. 233
Bretigny, Treaty of, i. 320
Briand, Aristide, ii. 536, 552
Brienne, ministry of, ii. 298
Brissac, Marshal, i. 502
Britons, expedition of Gauls against, i. 52
Brittany, i. 73, 297, 333, 411, 447
Broglie, ministry of, ii. 472
Brumaire, 18th, ii. 373
Brune, General, ii. 370 *sqq.*, 383, 395, 464
Brunhilde, i. 96-103
Brunswick, Duke of, ii. 331, 334, 406, 454
Bruyère, La, ii. 204, 231
Bude, i. 470
Burchard, John, i. 132
Burgundians, i. 69, 75, 85, 348
Burgundy, acquisition by France, i. 183; John of, 346 *sqq.*; second house of, 321, 339, 342, 358, 408
Byzantine Empire, i. 150

Cabochins, the, i. 349, 350
Cadoudal, ii. 392
Caesar in Gaul, i. 50 *sqq.*
Caesar Borgia, i. 458
Calais, siege of, i. 302, 504
Calonne, ii. 297
Calvin, John, ii. 3
Calvinists, ii. 12 *sqq.*, 173. *See also* Protestants, persecution of
Cambon, Jules, ii. 539
Cambrai, League of, i. 461; Treaty of, 489
Campo-Formio, Treaty of, ii. 364
Camulogenus, i. 56
Canada, ii. 247
Canute, King, i. 185
Capet, Hugh, i. 178
Capetian Dynasty, i. 179
Capetian-Valois, i. 295
Capitularies of Charlemagne, i. 145
Capuchins, i. 277
Caribert, i. 95, 113
Carloman, i. 131, 135, 167
Carmelites, i. 277
Carnot of the Committee of Public Safety, ii. 345, 354; Ministry of the Interior, 453; Sadi Carnot, 532
Carolingian France, i. 126-173
Castille, French intervention at, i. 326
Castillon, Battle of, i. 392
Cateau-Cambresis, Treaty of, i. 504
Catholicism in France, wars of religion, ii. 3-71, 323, 525, 536, 542
Catinat, Marshal, ii. 174, 182
Cavaignac, General, ii. 489, 535
Celts, i. 29
Centenier, the, i. 142
Cerdagne and Roussillon, acquisition of, i. 403
Chabannes, Anthony de, i. 396
Châlons, Battle of, i. 70; Council of, 105
Chambord, Count of, ii. 491, 520, 523
Champ de Mai, ii. 453
Champ de Mars, i. 110, 128, ii. 320, 325, 341
Charlemagne i. 3, 135-151; Roman emperor in the West, 139; government of, 142; dismemberment of empire of, 152
Charles II. the Bald, i. 160-167
Charles III. the Simple, i. 168
Charles IV. the Fair, i. 293
Charles V. the Wise, i. 322-337; war with Navarre, 323; with England, 325, 327; foreign policy of, 329
Charles VI., i. 337-357; his uncles, 338, 342, 345; the *Marmousets*, 343; madness of, 344; Civil War, 348; Treaty of Troyes, 356
Charles VII. the Victorious, i. 357-399; siege of Orleans, 360; Joan of Arc, 363; consecration of, 367; Treaty of Arras, 377; English expelled from France, 380; the Praguerie, 384; standing army, 387; Pragmatic Sanction, 389; conquest of Normandy, 390; of Guienne and Bordeaux, 391; end of Hundred Years' War, 392; death of, 397
Charles VIII., i. 438-456; marriage with Anne of Brittany, 447; conquest and loss of Naples, 452; Italian wars, 450 *sqq.*; King of Jerusalem, Emperor of the East, 454; death of, 455
Charles IX., ii. 10-30; regency of Catherine de Medici, 10; Huguenots and Catholics, 12; Civil Wars, 14, 20, 21, 29; siege of Rouen, 15; Peace of Amboise, 17; Peace of Longjumeau, 20; of St. Germain, 24; Massacre of St. Bartholomew, 24; Peace of La Rochelle, 29; death of, 29
Charles X., ii. 467, 469
Charles V. of Austria, i. 480 *sqq.*
Charles, Archduke of Austria, ii. 370, 401, 422 *sqq.*
Charles the Bold of Burgundy, i. 408 *sqq.*

Charles I. of England, ii. 95
Charles II. of England, ii. 153, 164
Charles the Fat, son of Louis the German, ii. 168
Charles of Lorraine, i. 180
Charles Martel, i. 129
Charles of Navarre. *See* Navarre
Charles II. of Spain, ii. 153
Charles XII. of Sweden, ii. 189
Chartier, Alan, i. 358, 398
Chartres, capture of, ii. 58
Chateaubriant, Edict of, i. 499
Chateaubriant, i. 417
Chateaux of France, i. 517
Chatillon, Marshal, ii. 100
Cherasco, peace of, ii. 105
Chiari, defeat of, ii. 183
Childebert I., i. 85; Childebert II., 102
Childeric I. i. 72; Childeric II., 123; Childeric III., 132
Chilperic I., i. 95-101; Chilperic II., 129; Chilperic III., 131
China, Emperor of, ii. 505
Choiseul, Duke of, ii. 254, 257, 274
Chouans, ii. 338
Christianity in Gaul, i. 63
Church, power of the, i. 171, 226; alliance with monarchy, ii. 465
Cimbri, i. 49
Cinq-Mars, ii. 97
Cintra, capitulation of, ii. 421
Cisalpine Gaul, i. 43
Civilis, i. 65
Civilisation, mediæval, i. 209; of thirteenth century, 264
Civil Wars, i. 349, ii. 8, 14, 20, 29, 32, 36, 38
Clemenceau, Georges, ii. 535, 542, 551
Clement V., i. 285; Clement IX., ii. 184
Clementine of Hungary, i. 292
Clergy, in Gaul, i. 104; in feudal system, 197, 402, 509, ii. 199, 266; civil constitution of the, 323
Clerical Party, movement against, ii. 526, 555
Clermont, Council of, i. 216
Clisson, Oliver de, i. 323, 343
Clodion and Meroveus, legend of, i. 70
Clodoald, i. 92
Clodomir, i. 85, 91
Clotaire I., i. 85; Clotaire II., 102, 119; Clotaire III., 123
Cloth of Gold, Field of the, i. 482
Clotilda, i. 79
Clovis I., i. 74; Clovis II., 122
Coalition, European, against France, ii. 158, 172, 180, 338, 369, 441, 479
Cocherel, Battle of, i. 324
Code Louis, ii. 150
Code Napoleon, ii. 414
Code *Noir*, ii. 150
Cœur, Jacques, i. 397
Colbert, Jean Baptiste, ii. 133 *sqq.*; death of, 166
Coligny, Gaspard de, i. 504 *sqq.*, ii. 23
Collège de France, i. 522, ii. 543
Colonial Empire of France, i. 512, ii. 76, 141, 163, 246, 253, 255, 291, 387, 391, 475, 478, 480, 481, 504, 540
Columbanus, St., i. 102, 132
Comines, Philip de, i. 419, 436
Commerce, i. 223, 262, 267, 436, 467, ii. 76, 230, 246, 269, 388, 416, 483, 486, 498, 507, 530
Communal Revolution, i. 232
Communes, charters of the, i. 228
Concini, Concino, ii. 84, 90
Concordat of Leo X., i. 478; of Napoleon, ii. 387
Condé, Louis I. of, ii. 3 *sqq.*; death of, 22; Louis II., the great Condé, ii. 85, 90, 115, 125, 127, 155 *sqq.*; last campaign of, 162; Prince of, ii. 303
Conflans, Treaty of, i. 407
Constance, Council of, i. 357
Constance, Queen, i. 182
Constantine, i. 64
Constantinople, Frankish Empire at, i. 250; fall of, 392
Constitution, perpetual, of 615, i. 119; necessity of, ii. 303; of 1791, 326; of the Year III., 352; of the Year VIII., 374; of the Year XII., 394; of 1875, 523
Consulate, the, ii. 375-393
Convention, National, ii. 336-353
Cordeliers, i. 277; club of the, ii. 321
Corneille, ii. 144, 211
Corsica, ii. 256
Courtrai, Battle of, i. 281
Coutras, Battle of, ii. 43
Craon, Peter de, i. 343
Crecy, Battle of, i. 300
Crequi, Marshal, ii. 164
Crespin and Crespinianus, i. 64
Crespy, Peace of, i. 495
Crèvecœur, General, i. 432
Crimean War, ii. 500
Cromwell, alliance between France and, ii. 129

Crusades, i. 216, 218, 221, 238, 244, 249, 257, 259, 346
Cunibert, Bishop of Cologne, i. 126
Custine, General, ii. 335, 346

Danes, i. 85
Danès, i. 470
Danton, ii. 321, 331, 332, 338, 339, 342
Dantonists, ii. 342
Dardanelles, ii. 477
Davout, Marshal, ii. 395, 407, 411, 422 *sqq.*, 438, 461
Delcassé, Theophile, ii. 537, 538, 550
Delorme, Philibert, i. 519
Denain, Battle of, ii. 190
Denis, St., i. 64; Abbey of, 121; Battle of, ii. 20
Desaix, General, ii. 362, 368, 383
Dettingen, Battle of, ii. 241
Diana of Poitiers, i. 498
Didier, King of the Lombards, i. 136
Didier, St., i. 102
Dijon, Treaty of, i. 466
Directory, the, ii. 354-375
Dizier, siege of St., i. 495
Dol, siege of, i. 187
Dominic, St., and the Dominicans, i. 277
Dormans, Battle of the, ii. 33
Dorylaeum, Battle of, i. 218
Dreux, Battle of, ii. 16
Dreyfus case, the, ii. 534
Drogo, Bishop of Metz, i. 126
Druids, i. 34, 65
Dubois, Abbé, ii. 225, 231
Dubourg, Anne, ii. 5
Dumas, ii. 544
Dumouriez, ii. 329, 333, 339, 345
Dunois the brave, i. 360, 369, 376, 408, 439, 445, 448
Dupes, day of the, ii. 97
Dupleix, ii. 244
Duprat, Chancellor, i. 475, 513
Duquesne, ii. 163
Duras, Marshal, ii. 174
Duruy, Victor, i. vii, ii. 514, 526, 541

Ebroïn, i. 96, 123
Eckmühl, Battle of, ii. 422
Economists, ii. 278, 497
Education, i. 61, 146, ii. 415, 499, 541
Edward the Confessor, i. 213
Edward III. of England, i. 296; expedition into France, 299, 307
Edward IV., expedition into France, i. 422
Edward VI., i. 500
Edward VII., ii. 527, 537
Egypt, Bonaparte's expedition into, ii. 365 *sqq.*; loss of, 386
Einhard, i. 131, 140, 149
Eligius, St., i. 121
Elizabeth, Queen, i. 504; ii. 42, 81
Emigrants, the, ii. 316, 328, 451
Empire, the, ii. 394
Enghien, Duke d', death of, ii. 393
England, Norman Conquest, i. 213; conflict with Louis VI., 232; union with Normandy and Anjou, 234; vast possessions in France, 240; expedition of Louis VIII. against, 253; defeat at Taillebourg, 256; Hundred Years' War, 295; Edward III. in France, 299; Crecy, 300; Black Prince in France, 307; Poitiers, 309; negotiations, 318; new expedition to France, 318; Treaty of Bretigny, 320; Battle of Auray, 325; Guienne, 327; invasion of France, 330; Black Prince in France, 330 *sqq.*; Agincourt, 351, 353; capture of Rouen, 354; Treaty of Troyes, 356; Henry VI., King of France, 357; siege of Orleans, 360; Joan of Arc, 363 *sqq.*; coronation of Henry VI. at Paris, 375; expulsion of English from France, 380 *sqq.*; end of Hundred Years' War, 392; Edward IV. in France, 422; Henry VII. lands at Calais, 452; Henry VIII. at Calais, 466; marriage of Louis XII. to Mary of England, 466; negotiations with Francis I., 482; alliance with France, 486; treaty with Francis I., 495; capture of Calais, 504; intervention in France under Turenne, ii. 58; alliance of Cromwell with France, 129; Treaty of Breda, 153; Charles II. declares war on France, 164; revolution, 171; France attempts to restore James II., 172; Marlborough in Low Countries, 181; Blenheim, 185; peace with France, 190; alliance with Louis XV., 224; England and Germany defeat France at Det-

tingen, 241; Fontenoy, 242; American War, 287; armed neutrality against, 289; coalition against France, 338; Toulon given up to, 340; Aboukir, 367; joins coalition against France, 369; continuation of hostilities, 385; Bonaparte plans invasion of, 387; plots against France, 392; Napoleon's camp at Boulogne, 398; Trafalgar, 401; blockade of, 409; Wellesley's forces fight against France in Portugal, 421; capture and loss of Flushing, 426; Wellington in Spain, 441; in France, 444; Waterloo, 455; Napoleon claims protection of, 460; Quadruple Alliance, 473; right of visit, 481; Crimean War, 500; friendly relations between France and England, 537; Entente Cordiale, 537
Enguerrand de Marigny, i. 291
Entente Cordiale, ii. 537
Entraigues, Henriette d', ii. 80
Éprémesnil, ii. 299
Erasmus, i. 522
Erkinoald, i. 122
Essling, Battle of, ii. 423
Estaing, Count d', ii. 289
Estate, Third, i. 264, 509, ii. 199, 307
Estates, the Three, i. 227, ii. 306; fusion of, 308
Estrées, Gabrielle d', ii. 80; Vice-Admiral d', 163
Étaples, Treaty of, i. 452
Eudes, Duke of Aquitaine, i. 130; Duke of France, 170, 174 *sqq.*
Eugène, Prince, ii. 101, 185
Eugenie, Empress, ii. 495
Eugenius, i. 67
Eustace de St. Pierre, i. 302
Eylau, ii. 409

Fallières, President, ii. 550
Famille, Pacte de, ii. 254
Famine, Pacte de, ii. 260
Fashoda, ii. 537
Faure, President, ii. 534
Favre, Jules, ii. 516
Fayette, La, ii. 287, 313, 315, 321, 331
Federation, the, ii. 320
Fénelon, ii. 201, 274
Ferdinand I. of Spain, i. 452
Ferry, Jules, ii. 522, 526, 541, 542
Feudal France, i. 174-242
Feudalism, ecclesiastical, i. 197, 226
Feudal system, i. 4, 170; society, 189; transformation of, 508; hierarchy, 193; kingdoms, under Napoleon, ii. 418
Fiefs, beginning of great, i. 166
Finance, i. 280, 290, 323, 335, 513, ii. 74, 103, 137, 167, 223, 226, 260, 265, 307, 318, 320, 363, 388, 486, 497
Flanders, Wars of, i. 234, 279, 339, ii. 153; affairs of, i. 296, 342
Flaochat, i. 122
Fleix, Peace of, ii, 38
Fleurus, ii. 349
Fleury, Abbé, ii. 234 *sqq.*, 239
Florus, i. 65
Fontainebleau, i. 517
Fontaine-Française, Battle of, ii. 66
Fontanet, Battle of, i. 157
Fontenoy, Battle of, ii. 242
Fool's War, the, i. 445
Formigny, Battle of, i. 390
Fornovo, Battle of, i. 452
Fouquet, Nicholas, ii. 131, 135
Four Nations, College of the, ii. 131
Francis I., i. 473-514; crosses the Alps, 476; peace with the Swiss, 478; Concordat with Leo X., 478; aspires to revive empire, 480; war with Charles V., 483; triple invasion of France, 484; prisoner at Pavia, 486; other wars with Charles V., 488, 492, 494; Reformation, 491; wars of religion, 496; death of, 497; policy and government of, 506
Francis II., ii. 1-9; regency of Catherine de Medici, 2; wars of religion, 3 *sqq.*
Francis of Assisi and the Franciscans, i. 277
Franco-Prussian War, ii. 508-520
Frankfort, Treaty of, ii. 319
Frankish Empire, fall of first dynasty, i. 125; monarchy, i. 109
Franks, i. 67 *sqq.*
Fredegar, i. 95, 104, 121
Fredegonde, i. 96-103
Frederic II., Emperor, i. 256
Frederic the Great, ii. 239, 251
Freemasons, ii. 295, 526
Free-Men, i. 108
French language, first example of, i. 158; development of, 273
Friedland, ii. 412
Froissart, i. 297, 336
Fronde, the, ii. 119, 123
Frontiers, fortification of, ii. 147
Fructidor, the 18th, ii. 364

Gabelle, the, i. 305. *See* Taxation
Galatians, i. 46
Galigaï, Leonora, ii. 91
Gall, St., i. 132
Gallo-Romans, i. 106
Galswintha, i. 96-99
Gambetta, Leon, ii. 517 *sqq.*, 531
Garibaldi, ii. 514
Gascon nobles, i. 328
Gascony, i. 328, ii. 44
Gaston de Foix, i. 463
Gaul, independent, i. 2, 31 *sqq.*; migrations of the Gauls, 39; conquest of by Romans, 48; under Roman Empire, 59; state of in 6th century, 103
Geneviève, St., i. 79
George I. of England, ii. 224
Gepidae, i. 71
Germain, Bishop of Paris, i. 99
Germain, Peace of St., ii. 24, 122
Germans in Gaul, i. 52 *sqq.*; alliance with Protestant, 489, 499
Germany, created by Charlemagne, i. 151; campaign of Louis XIV. in, ii. 182; declaration to, 329; Napoleon intervenes in, 391; campaign of Napoleon against, 440 *sqq.*; German army in France, 444; Germany again threatens France, 527; relations between France and, 538
Ghent, siege of, ii. 243
Gibraltar, ii. 187, 291, 387
Gilbert of Nogent, i. 205, 222
Girondins, the, ii. 328, 336, 339, 342
Glaber, Raoul, i. 183, 205, 211
Golden Fleece, Order of the, i. 395
Gondebad, i. 87
Gondeberga, i. 121
Gonsalvo da Cordova, i. 459
Gontran, i. 95, 101
Goths, i. 71
Grace, Edict of, ii. 96
Grand Companies, the, i. 326
Grand Jours, the, ii. 96
Granson, Battle of, i. 423
Grasse, Count de, ii. 290
Greeks, i. 31, 329; struggle for independence, ii. 468
Gregory of Langres, i. 88
Gregory of Tours, i. 72, 86, 100, 111, 113
Gregory the Great, i. 132; Gregory IV., 155; Gregory VII., 212; Gregory XIII., ii. 40; Gregory XIV., 59
Grenoble, Parliament of, i. 388
Grévy, Jules, ii. 520, 531
Grimoald, i. 122, 127
Guelders, expedition against Duke of, i. 342, 420
Guérande, Treaty of, i. 325
Guesclin, Du, i. 323, 324
Guienne, War of, i. 279; confiscation of by Charles V., 327 *sqq.*, 391, 499
Guilds, i. 268
Guillotine, permanence of the, ii. 341
Guinegate, Battle of, i. 432
Guise, house of, i. 498, ii. 3 *sqq.*, 16, 35, 47
Guizot, ministry of, ii. 472, 476, 479
Gustavus Adolphus, ii. 106
Guyon, Mme., ii. 201

Hachette, Joan, i. 418
Hague, Grand Alliance of the, ii. 180
Hannibal, i. 44
Harcourt, Count d', i. 299, 308
Harold the Saxon, i. 214
Haroun-al-Raschid, i. 150
Hastings, Battle of, i. 215
Hastings the Northman, i. 165
Havre-de-Grace, i. 497
Helvetii, i. 50, 51
Henry I. of France, i. 184
Henry II. of France, i. 498-514; alliance with Scotland, 499
Henry III. of France, ii. 30-52
Henry IV. (Henry of Navarre), ii. 52-83; conversion of, 64; Edict of Nantes, 70; administration of, 72-82; assassination of, 82
Henry I. of England, conflict of Louis VI. with, i. 232
Henry II. of England, i. 240
Henry III. of England, defeat of Taillebourg, i. 256
Henry V. of England, i. 351
Henry VI. of England, King of France, i. 357; coronation at Paris, 375
Henry VII. of England, i. 445
Henry VIII. of England, i. 466, 495
Henries, War of the Three, ii. 43
Henrietta, Mme., ii. 157
Henrietta Maria, ii. 95
Herbertists, ii. 342
Hericourt, Battle of, i. 421
Herrings, Battle of the, i. 360
Hilary, St., i. 64
Hildebrand and Hadebrand, i. 148
Hincmar, Bishop of Reims, i. 143, 168, 200
Hire, La, i. 360
Hoche, General, ii. 346, 351, 354, 364
Hogue, Battle of La, ii. 173

Hohenlinden, Battle of, ii. 383
Holland, war with, ii. 156
Holy Spirit, Order of the, ii. 37
Honorius, i. 67, 69, 70
Hôpital, Chancellor l', ii. 8, 11, 21
Hospitallers, Order of the, i. 223
Hospitals, reign of Louis XV., ii. 273
Houchard, General, ii. 346
Hubertsburg, Treaty of, ii. 254
Hugh the Great, Duke of France, i. 177
Hugo, Victor, ii. 543, 544
Huguenots, persecution of, i. 492, ii. 5 *sqq.*, 32; destruction of, 95
Hundred Days, the, ii. 453
Hundred Years' War, i. 295-379
Hungarians, arrival in France of, i. 161
Hunold, Duke of Aquitaine, i. 131, 135
Huns, the, i. 71

Iberians or Basques, i. 30
Iconoclastic controversy, i. 132
Idutiomar the Treveran, i. 53
Importants, Cabale des, ii. 114
Industry, i. 223, 262, 268, ii. 76, 139, 230, 269, 387, 416, 482, 486, 496, 530
Ingelheim, i. 146
Innocent II., Pope, i. 244; Innocent III., 249
Intendants, ii. 102
Ireland, ii. 172
Irenaeus, St., i. 64
Isabella of Bavaria, Queen of France, i. 346
Isidorian Decretals, Pseudo-, i. 172
Italian Wars, i. 136, 450-472
Italy, conquest of by Normans, i. 213; in 15th century, 450; campaign of Louis XIV. in, ii. 182, 185; wars of Napoleon, 355; influence of Napoleon in, 390; Napoleon, King of, 397; Eugène Beauharnais, Viceroy of, 418; protected by France from Austrian domination, 491; war between France and Austria in, 502
Ivry, Battle of, ii. 56

Jacobins, the, ii. 304, 321, 325
Jacquerie, the, i. 314
Jacques, Battle of St., i. 386
James I. of England, ii. 152
James II. of England, ii. 172
James IV. of Scotland, i. 465
Jansenists, ii. 200
January, Edict of, i. 12
Jarnac, Battle of, ii. 22
Jaurés, Jean, ii. 535, 552
Jemappes, victory of, ii. 335
Jena, Battle of, ii. 407
Jerome St., i. 47
Jerusalem, capture of, i. 219; organisation of kingdom of, 221
Jesuit Order, ii. 257, 526
Jews, persecution of, i. 183, 292; in modern France, ii. 527, 535
Joan of Arc, i. 363 *sqq.*
Joanna of Naples, Queen, i. 321
Joffre, ii. 552
John Scotus Erigena, i. 200
John the Fearless of Burgundy, i. 346 *sqq.*, 355
John the Good, King of France, i. 306-322
Joinville, Sieur de, i. 257, 276; Treaty of, ii. 39; Prince of, 476, 478, 484
Jornandès, i. 71
Jourdan, General, ii. 346, 350, 354, 370, 395
Judicaël, Duke of the Bretons, i. 121
Judicial organisation of Louis IX., i. 260; Louis XII., 469; of the Renaissance, 523; Code Louis, ii. 159, 263; reforms, 319; Code Napoleon, 414, 482, 495

Kiderlen-Waechter, ii. 539
Kiersy, Edict of, i. 167
Kleber, General, ii. 346, 349, 367, 386
Klosterseven, capitulation of, ii. 249
Knighthood, institution of, i. 223
Knights Hospitallers, i. 223; of Rhodes, 223; Templars, 223; destruction of order, 286
Krefeld, Battle of, ii. 250

Labienus, i. 54
Lackland, John, i. 244
Lafitte, ministry of, ii. 470
Lamartine, ii. 486 *sqq.*
Lanfranc, i. 202
Lannes, Marshal, ii. 381, 395, 412, 424
Laon, commune of, i. 230
Lautbec, Marshal, i. 476, 488
Law, John, ii. 227
Lawfeld, victory of, ii. 244
Laws, Barbarian, i. 110; Salic, 112, 292; Roman, 266; customary, 469; Code Louis, ii. 150; civil law, reign of Louis XV., 267; Code Napoleon, 414; of separation, 534

League, the Holy, i. 462, 488, ii. 34, 61
Lefebvre, Marshal, ii. 412
Leger, St., Bishop of Autun, i. 124
Legion of Honour, ii. 388, 397
Leo IX., i. 213; Leo X., Concordat of, 478; Leo XIII., ii. 527
Leoben, preliminaries of, ii. 361
Leptines, Council of, i. 132
Lescot, Pierre, i. 519
Lesseps, Ferdinand de, ii. 505, 533
Leudaste, Count, i. 113
Lille, defence of, ii. 335
Limoges, sack of, i. 330
Lionne, Hugh de, ii. 135, 151
Literature, under Charlemagne, i. 147; in 13th century, 273; under Charles V., 336; Louis XI., 436; Louis XII., 470; Renaissance, 524; Henry IV., ii. 78; Louis XIV., 144, 205, 221; Louis XV., 275; under Napoleon, 417; Charles X., 467; in latter part of 19th century, 543 *sqq.*
Lites, the, i. 108
Lombards, the, i. 96
London, Treaty of, i. 466, ii. 478, 538
Longjumeau, Peace of, ii. 20
Longwy, capture of, ii. 332
Lorges, Duke de, ii. 174
Lorraine, i. 359, 387, 420, 423, ii. 178, 239, 256, 510, 519
Lothaire, i. 155
Loubet, President, ii. 535, 537, 550
Loudon, Treaty of, ii. 89
Louis I. the Pious, i. 152-157
Louis II. the Stammerer, i. 169
Louis III., i. 169
Louis IV. the Foreigner, i. 177
Louis V., i. 178
Louis VI. the Fat, i. 225-236
Louis VII. the Young, i. 237-242
Louis VIII., i. 243-254
Louis IX., St. Louis, i. 254; firmness to emperor and pope, defeats English, 256; crusade of, 257; administration of, 260 *sqq.*; Pragmatic Sanction, 262; last crusade of, 263
Louis X., i. 291
Louis XI., i. 400-438
Louis XII., i. 456-472; Italian campaign, 457 *sqq.*; Treaties of Blois, 460; league of Cambrai, 461; Holy League, 462; Battle of Spurs, 465; administration of, 467
Louis XIII., ii. 84-113; regency of Marie de Medici, 84; revolt of nobles, 85; ministry of Richelieu, 90-110; Albert de Luynes, 91; war with Protestants, 93; with Austria, 104; Thirty Years' War, 106; death of, 112
Louis XIV. the Great, ii. 113-221; regency of Anne of Austria, 113; victories of Condé and Turenne, 115; Treaty of Westphalia, 116; day of the barricades, 121; war of the *Fronde*, 123; alliance with Cromwell, 129; league of the Rhine, 130; internal organisation, 133; personal government, 134 *sqq.*; external history and conquests, 151-165; last period of reign, 165-195; death of, 195; government of, 195-205; age of, 205-221
Louis XV., ii. 222-281; minority of, 222; alliance with England, 224; war with Spain, 224; ministry of Bourbon, 232; of Fleury, 235; reconciliation with Spain, War of Polish Succession, 237; of Austrian Succession, 238; alliance with Prussia, 239; campaign of Bohemia, 239; Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, 245; Seven Years' War, 246; suppression of Jesuits, 257; state of France at end of reign, 261-281
Louis XVI., ii. 281-338; ministry of Malesherbes and Turgot, 282; of Necker, 285, 301; American War, 287; Treaty of Versailles, 291; ministry of Calonne, 297; of Brienne, 298; States-General, 301; National Assembly, 303-327; Legislative Assembly, 328-335; the Convention, 336; death of, 336
Louis XVII., ii. 363 (note)
Louis XVIII., ii. 363, 446, 450, 461; death of, 467
Louis Philippe, ii. 470
Louis the German, i. 156
Louise of Savoy, regency of, i. 486
Louvois, Marquis de, ii. 133 *sqq.*
Louvre, the, i. 519, ii. 78, 167, 220, 496
Low Countries, war in, ii. 175, 182, 185, 350
Ludovico the Moor, i. 451
Lügenfeld, i. 156
Lulli, ii. 144, 206
Luneville, Peace of, ii. 384
Lupus, St., i. 71
Lützen, victory of, ii. 441
Luxemburg, Marshal, ii. 164, 175
Luynes, Albert de, ii. 91, 93

Lyons, Council of, i. 105; Oecumenical Council of, 257; insurrection at, ii. 472

Macdonald, General, ii. 370, 383, 442
Macmahon, Marshal, ii. 503, 516, 521, 523, 526
Macon, Council of, i. 105
Madame la Grande, i. 448
Madrid, Treaty of, i. 487
Magnetism, ii. 295
Maillotins and Tuchins, i. 338
Mainmortables, i. 204
Maintenon, Mme. de, ii. 133, 167, 189, 203
Maitre, Gilles le, i. 514
Malebranche, ii. 213
Malesherbes, Lamoignon de, ii. 282, 285, 337, 342
Malherbe, ii. 79
Malplaquet, Battle of, ii. 189
Manants, i. 204
Mantuan Succession, War of, ii. 105
Marat, ii. 331, 339, 340, 341
Marcel Etienne, i. 311, 317
Marengo, ii. 379
Margaret of Navarre, i. 491
Margaret of Scotland, i. 397
Maria Theresa, ii. 153, 239
Marie Antoinette, ii. 295, 341
Marie of France, i. 274
Marignano, Battle of, i. 476
Marlborough, Duke of, ii. 180 *sqq.*
Marly, ii. 167, 221
Marmousets, ministry of, i. 343
Marseilles, plague of, ii. 231
Martignac ministry, ii. 468
Martin, St., i. 64
Mary Stuart, i. 500, ii. 2, 9
Mary Tudor, i. 502, 504
Masséna, General, ii. 356, 370 *sqq.*, 380, 395, 401, 422 *sqq.*, 434, 440
Massiliots, i. 48
Maupeou, ii. 282
Maur, Treaty of St., i. 407
Maurepas, ii. 238, 282, 284
Mayors of the palace, i. 96, 109, 122
Maximilian de Bethune. *See* Sully
Maximilian of Austria, i. 432 *sqq.*
Maximinian, i. 66
Mayenne, Duke of, ii. 53 *sqq.*, 67
Mazarin, Cardinal, ii. 113 *sqq.*; exile of, 126; return of, 128; internal administration of, 131; death of, 132
Medici, Pietro di, i. 451; Catherine de, 490; regency of, ii. 2, 10 *sqq.*, 51; Marie de, regency of, 84
Medicine, i. 524, ii. 292, 543
Ménippée, Satire, ii. 61
Mercantile marine, ii. 76, 246
Mercœur, Duke of, ii. 69
Merovingian France, i. 74-125
Mersen, Edict of, i. 163
Metz, siege of, i. 501
Milan, i. 483
Milanese, the loss and conquest of, i. 457
Milesian virgins, i. 46
Military orders, the, i. 223
Minorca, conquest of, ii. 248
Mirabeau, ii. 305 *sqq.*, 318, 322
Missi Dominici, the, i. 143
Missionaries, Frankish, i. 132
Mohammedan invasion, i. 3, 130
Molé, Matthew, ii. 121
Molé, ministry of, ii. 475
Molière, ii. 137, 144, 211
Moltke, von, ii. 528
Monasteries, i. 106, ii. 323
Mons-en-Puelle, Battle of, i. 283
Monsieur, peace of, ii. 33
Montagnards, ii. 328, 336, 339
Montaigne, i. 524 *sqq.*
Montargis, siege of, i. 359
Montcontours, Battle of, ii. 23
Montecuculi, General, ii. 162
Montespan, Mme., ii. 194, 203
Montesquieu, ii. 231, 275
Montfort, Simon de, i. 251; John and Jeanne de, 297, 325
Montlhéry, Battle of, i. 405
Montluc, Blaise de, ii. 15
Montmorency, Constable, i. 499
Montpensier, marriage of Duke of, ii. 482
Montsabert, Goislard de, ii. 300
Morat, Battle of, i. 423
Moreau, General, ii. 354 *sqq.*, 371, 380, 393, 441, 442
Mortemar, Battle of, i. 185
Moulins, ordinance of, ii. 19
Murat, General, ii. 385, 404, 408, 410, 420, 446
Music, ii. 144, 219, 292, 548

Nancy, Battle of, i. 424
Nantes, Edict of, ii. 70; revocation of, 168
Naples, conquest of, i. 263; Ferdinand of, 450, 452, 458; Joseph Bonaparte, King of, ii. 418
Napoleon I., youth of, ii. 354; campaign in Italy, 355; Egyptian

expedition, 365; return to France, 373; consulate, 375-393; Marengo, 379; Hohenlinden, 383; Concordat, 387; first consul, 389; intervenes in Italy and Switzerland, 390; in Germany, 391; raises colonial empire of France, 391; Emperor of the French, 394; coronation, 396; King of Italy, 397; Trafalgar, 401; Austerlitz, 401; Treaty of Pressburg, Confederation of the Rhine, 403; Prussian campaign, 405; Jena and Auerstadt, 407; Eylau, 409; Friedland, 412; Civil Code, 414; conquest of Portugal, 418; invasion of Spain, 419; Abensberg and Eckmühl, 422; Essling, 423; Wagram, 424; marriage with Marie Louise, 427; rupture with Russia, 434; campaign in Russia, 435; in Germany, 440; in France, 443; abdication of, 447; return from Elba, 452; Hundred Days, 453; Waterloo, 455; second abdication of, 459; St. Helena, 460; death, 461
Napoleon II., King of Rome, ii. 427, 459
Napoleon II., Louis Napoleon, President of Republic, ii. 490; ten years' presidency, 493; declaration of empire, 495; Crimean War, 500; war in Italy, 502; expeditions to Syria, China, etc., 504; Franco-Prussian War, 508-520; death of, 522
Naval battles, i. 465, ii. 163, 192, 289, 351, 367, 401
Navarino, Battle of, ii. 468
Navarre, kingdom of, i. 309, 482; Charles the Bad of, 309, 316, 323, 324; Henry of, ii. 41. *See* Henry IV. of France
Navy, French, i. 512, ii. 103, 143, 244, 252, 255, 399, 418, 524
Necker, ii. 285, 301, 309, 322
Nemours, house of, i. 427
Neuss, siege of, i. 421
Neustrians, i. 96
Ney, Marshal, ii. 395, 401, 411 *sqq.*, 426, 434, 438, 442, 455 *sqq.*, 464
Nice, Truce of, i. 494
Nicopolis, crusade of, i. 346
Niel, Marshal, ii. 514, 524
Nimwegen, assembly of, i. 155; Treaty of, ii. 164
Nobility, letters of, i. 293
Nobles, revolt of, ii. 85, 89; repression of, 97; submission of, 197; abolition of privileges of, 313
Nomenoë, King of the Bretons, i. 161, 166
Norman Conquest, i. 213
Normandy, Dukes of, i. 185, 311; kingdom of, 234; conquest of, 390; recovery of, 408; parliament of, 469
Northmen, i. 141, 161, 164, 176
Notables, assemblies of, ii. 69, 101, 298
Novara, defeat of, i. 465
Noyon, Treaty of, i. 480

Odilon of Bavaria, i. 131
Odo, St., i. 188
Odoacer, i. 73
Offices, hereditary right in, i. 191; venality of, 469
Ogger, Count, i. 150
Orders, the Mendicant, i. 277
Orders, the Three. *See* Estates.
Ordinances, i. 289, 312, 389
Orleans, assembly of, i. 105; Duke of, taken prisoner at Agincourt, 352; siege of, 360; relief of, 366; ordinance of, 383; Louis of, 433; Treaty of, 466; Gaston of, ii. 99; Philip, married Henrietta of England, 157; Philip, regent during minority of Louis XV., 221; death of, 231; Louis, Duke of, 300, 306, 309, 339; Duke of, 476, 480
Orvilliers, Count d', ii. 289
Ostrogoths, i. 90
Ouadâs or diviners, i. 35
Oudenarde, Battle of, ii. 188
Oudinot, General, ii. 405, 425, 439, 442, 491
Ouen of Rouen, St., i. 337

Palestine, foundation of Latin kingdom in, i. 220
Palice, Marshal la, i. 464 *sqq.*
Panama Canal, ii. 533
Papacy, i. 130, 132, 236, 502; Napoleon's rupture with, ii. 419
Paris, sieges of, i. 168, ii. 56, 517, 521; University of, i. 270; nobles arm against, 314; Treaty of, ii. 254, 461, 500; Count of, 476, 520, 523
Parliaments, i. 289, 334, 435, 469, 510, ii. 101, 196, 258
Parma, Duke of, ii. 56
Pascal, ii. 208, 213

Patay, Battle of, i. 367
Pavia, Battle of, i. 485
Peace of Dames, i. 489; perpetual, and the Swiss, 478
Peers or equals, i. 195; female, 337
Peronne, interview of, i. 411
Perrier, Casimir, ii. 471; grandson of, 534
Peter of Beaujeu, i. 438; the Deacon, 147; the Hermit 216, 239; de Latilly, 291; the Great in Paris, ii. 226
Petits Maîtres, or Young Fronde, ii. 125
Pheasant, vow of the, i. 393
Philip I., i. 187
Philip II. or Philip Augustus, coronation of, i. 241; reign of, 243-254; rivalry between Richard Cœur de Lion and, 244; third crusade, 244; victory of Bouvines, 245; fourth crusade, 249; English expedition, 252; relations with Rome, 253
Philip III. the Bold, i. 278
Philip IV. the Fair, i. 279-291
Philip V., i. 292
Philip VI. of Valois, i. 295-306
Philip the Bold of Burgundy, i. 338, 346 ; the Good of Burgundy, i. 358 *sqq.*
Philip II. of Spain, i. 503, ii. 18 *sqq.*, 61
Philip V. of Spain, ii. 233
Philosophy, i. 524, ii. 212, 548
Phoenicians, i. 30
Pichegru, General, ii. 347, 349, 363, 364, 392
Pilgrimages, i. 211
Pilnitz, declaration of, ii. 328
Pippin of Landes the Old, i. 120, 122, 126
Pippin d'Heristal, i. 124-128
Pippin the Short, i. 131; wars with Germany, 133; with Italy, 134; donation of, 134; conquest of Septimania and Aquitaine, 134; death of, 135
Pippin II., i. 166
Pisa, Council of, i. 466
Pistes, Edict of, i. 167
Pitigliano, i. 462
Plantes, Jardin des, ii. 112, 144
Plectruda, i. 128
Pleiade, the, i. 528
Poetry, i. 527, ii. 211
Poincaré, Raymond, ii. 550
Poissy, Conference of, ii. 12
Poitiers, victory of, i. 130; Battle of, 309; recovery of, 332
Pol, house of St., i. 429
Police, establishment of, i. 262; ii. 201
Polignacs, ii. 303; Polignac ministry, 468
Politiques, the, ii. 31
Pompadour, Mme. de, ii. 246, 254, 257
Pomponne, Arnault de, ii. 157
Pontoise, states of, i. 11
Portugal, conquest of, i. 215, ii. 418; loss of, 421
Pragmatic Sanction, i. 262, 389, 402
Praguerie, the, i. 384
Prairial, the 30th, ii. 372
Prégent de Bidoulx, i. 465
Press, laws regarding the, ii. 272, 465, 467, 470
Pressburg, Treaty of, ii. 403
Priests, unconstitutional, ii. 328
Prince Imperial, ii. 495, 516, 522
Printing, i. 436, 522
Protestants, persecution of, i. 492, 496, ii. 3-71; reconciliation with Catholics, 72; republican organisation of, 92; war against, 95, 168, 184, 200, 271; in modern France, 527
Provence, invasion of, i. 485, 493
Prussia, peace with, ii. 351; campaign of Napoleon against, 401; Prussians in France, 445; at Waterloo, 455; Franco-Prussian War, 508, 513
Public Good, League of the, i. 403
Public Safety, Committees of, ii. 339
Public works, i. 336, ii. 76, 141, 219, 292, 388, 415, 496
Pyrenees, Treaty of the, ii. 130

Quentin, Battle of St., i. 503
Quiberon, ii. 351
Quietists, ii. 200

Rabelais, i. 526
Racine, ii. 204, 211
Radegonde, St., i. 93
Raginfred, i. 129
Ragnachaire, i. 83
Rainulf, Duke of Aquitaine, i. 166
Ramillies, Battle of, ii. 185
Raoul de Lannoy, i. 432
Raoul de Presle, i. 291, 336
Rastadt, Treaty of, ii. 193
Raucoux, victory of, ii. 244
Raymond Lull, i. 277
Reformation, the, i. 491, ii. 3, *sqq.*

Regnier, ii. 79
Reichstadt, Duke of, ii. 472
Religion, Wars of, i. 496, ii. 3-71; religious difficulties, 525
Renaissance, i. 470, 515 *sqq.*
Renaudie, La, ii. 7
Renty, Battle of, i. 502
Republic, ii. 336; of 1848, 486; Third, 516
Restoration, the first, ii. 450; second, 464
Retz, Cardinal and Coadjutor de, ii. 121 *sqq.*, 207
Revolution, ii. 317; of 1830, 469; of 1848, 484
Rhine, League of the, ii. 130; Wars of the, 174, 188; Confederation of the, ii. 403
Richard Cœur de Lion, i. 244
Richard III. of England, i. 445
Richard the Justiciar, i. 166
Richelieu, Cardinal, ii. 87, 90, 94 *sqq.*; relations with Gustavus Adolphus, 106; Alliance with France against Austria, 107; death of, 110
Ripuarians, i. 109
Robert, King of France, i. 177, 182; of Sorbon, 263; the Strong, 165; d'Arbissel, 210; of Artois, 282, 296; le Coq, 311
Robespierre, ii. 321, 331, 339, 342
Rochefoucauld, Duke of La, ii. 203, 208
Rochelle, La, i. 332; Peace of, ii. 29; capture of, 95
Rohan, Cardinal de, ii. 296
Rois Fainéants, i. 127
Roland, ii. 329
Roman Empire, decline of, i. 48, 67
Rome, capture of, by Gauls, i. 40; sack of, 488
Romorantin, Edict of, ii. 8
Romulus Augustulus, i. 73
Ronsard, i. 527
Roosebeke, Battle of, i. 339
Rosbach, Battle of, ii. 249
Roscelin, i. 202
Rouen, capture of, i. 354; siege of, ii. 15, 59
Rousseau, Jean Jacques, ii. 275, 294
Russia, marriage of Henry I. to Russian princess, i. 184; campaigns against Napoleon, ii. 369 *sqq.*; Eylau, 409; rupture with France, 432; campaign of Napoleon in, 435; relations with France, 527
Ryswick, Treaty of, ii. 178
Sabinus and Eponina, i. 65
Saintes, Battle of, ii. 291
Salians, i. 66
Salic Law, i. 112, 292
Saucourt, victory of,
Savonarola, i. 452
Savoy, war with, ii. 161
Saxe, Marshal, ii. 242
Saxony, wars of, i. 137
Scherer, General, ii. 370
Schinner, Matthew, i. 463
Schism, the Great, i. 337, 389
Scholarship, i. 523
Scholasticism, i. 271
Science, i. 524, ii. 214, 279, 292, 417, 549
Scotland, alliance of France with, i. 279, 499
Scotus, Duns, i. 277
Scudéri, Mademoiselle, ii. 135
Sculpture, i. 203, 520, ii. 218
Sedan, ii. 509, 516
Seguier, Pierre, ii. 129, 150
Senef, Battle of, ii. 161
Senlis, assembly of, i. 180
Separation, law of, ii. 534
September, massacres of, ii. 332
Septennate, the, ii. 523
Septimus Severus, i. 64
Sequani, i. 51
Serfs, i. 8, 203, 227
Seven Years' War, ii. 246, 255
Sévigné, Mme. de, ii. 135, 208, 211
Shepherds, Crusade of the, i. 259
Sicilian Vespers, massacre of the, i. 279
Siéyès, Abbé, i. 303, 321, 373, 375
Sigebert, i. 82; Sigebert II., 122
Silk, manufacture of, i. 514, ii. 293, 416, 530
Silvester II., Pope, i. 201
Simon, Jules, ii. 517, 526
Simon, St., ii. 204, 221
Sixteen, the, ii. 49, 60
Slavery, i. 108, 112
Sluys, Battle of, i. 296
Soissons, victory of, i. 78; Council of, 132
Somme towns, i. 403
Sorbonne, the, i. 263, ii. 112
Sorcerers, the, i. 273
Sorel, Agnes, i. 397
Soult, Marshal, ii. 395, 402, 421, 426, 434; ministry of, 477
Spain, war with, i. 138, 458, ii. 66, 153; accession of French prince to throne, 178; reverses of France in, 187; war with France, 224; reconciliation, 237; invasion of,

350; peace with, 351; Napoleon's invasion of, 419 *sqq.*; Joseph Bonaparte, King of, 420; expedition against in 1823, 466
Spiritualists, the, i. 287
Spurs, Battle of the, i. 465
States-General, i. 290, 305, 307, 311, 440, 468, 510, ii. 61, 87; suppression of, 196; convocation of, 301, 306
Stephen II., Pope, i. 134; Stephen IV., 153
Strasburg, Oath of, i. 158
Suevi, i. 50
Suffren, Bailiff of, ii. 290
Suger, Abbot, i. 238, 241
Sully, ii. 66, 73
Sweden, ii. 292; Bernadotte, Prince Royal of, 429, 441
Switzerland, i. 386, 423; Napoleon mediates in, ii. 390
Syagrius, i. 73

Taïna, Treaty of, ii. 475
Taille, the, i. 383, 467, ii. 137, 230. *See also* Taxation
Taillebourg, victory of, i. 256
Tallard, General, ii. 183 *sqq.*
Talleyrand, ii. 396, 404, 450
Tavannes, Marshal, i. 502
Taxation, i. 146, 290, 305, 335, 467, ii. 137, 265, 269, 281, 283, 297, 470, 486
Tectosages, i. 45
Tellier, Michel le. *See* Louvois
Templars. *See* Knights Templars
Tennis Court, Oath of the, ii. 308
Terray, Abbé, ii. 257
Terror, the, ii. 338; the White Terror, 464
Testry, Battle of, i. 125
Teutoni, i. 52
Theodoric the Ostrogoth, i. 90
Theodosius the Great, i. 67
Theology, ii. 548
Thermidor, the 9th, ii. 342
Theudebald, i. 92
Theudebert, i. 90; Theudebert II., 102
Thierry, King of Metz, i. 85; Thierry II., 102; Thierry III., 124; Thierry IV., 131
Thiers, ii. 472, 475, 478, 483, 515, 518 *sqq.*, 524
Third Estate. *See* Estate
Thirty Years' War, ii. 106, 115
Thomas Aquinas, i. 277
Thou, de, i. 525
Thuringia, i. 85
Tilsit, Peace of, ii. 412
Tolentino, Peace of, ii. 360
Toulouse, parliament of, i. 388
Tournaments, i. 197
Tours, states of, i. 410; assembly of, 415
Tourville, ii. 172, 192
Trafalgar, ii. 401
Trémoille, Louis de la, i. 445 *sqq.*, 465, 484
Trent, Council of, ii. 67
Trianon, ii. 167
Tricolour, the, ii. 312
Trivulzio, Marshal, i. 465
Trochu, General, ii. 516
Troubadours, i. 197
Trouin, Duguay, ii. 192
Trouvères, i. 197, 274
Troyes, Council of, i. 173; Treaty of, 356
Truce of God, i. 5, 187
Tuileries, the, i. 519, ii. 167
Turenne, ii. 58, 115, 129, 154, 160 *sqq.*
Turgot, ii. 282 *sqq.*, 292
Turin, Battle of, ii. 185
Turks, alliance with, i. 489

Universities, i. 270, ii. 414
Utrecht, Treaty of, ii. 193

Val des Dunes, Battle of, i. 185
Valentinian, i. 67; Valentinian II., 67
Valery, St., i. 180
Valmy, victory of, ii. 333
Valtelline, war of the, ii. 104
Vandals, i. 69
Vassals, i. 194, 226
Vassy, massacre of, ii. 13
Vatable, i. 470
Vauban, Le Prestre de, ii. 133 *sqq.*, 274
Vaudois, massacre of the, i. 496
Vauvernague, ii. 278
Vendeans, the, ii. 347 *sqq.*
Vendémiaire, the 3rd, ii. 352
Vendôme, Duke of, ii. 183 *sqq.*
Vercingetorix, i. 54
Verdun, Treaty of, i. 157, 159; Bishop of, 411; capture of, ii. 332
Verona, Congress of, ii. 466
Versailles, ii. 167, 202, 220, 247; Treaty of, 291; assembly of, 521
Vervins, Treaty of, ii. 71
Victor Amadeus, ii. 109

Victoria, Queen, ii. 537
Vienna, Treaty of, ii. 233
Vikings. *See* Northmen
Vilains, i. 204
Villafranca, Peace of, ii. 502
Villars, Marshal, ii. 182 *sqq.*, 238
Villaviciosa, Battle of, ii. 189
Villehardouin, Geoffrey de, i. 249, 276
Villeneuve, Admiral, ii. 367, 400
Villeroy, General, ii. 183
Villon, François, i. 527
Visigoths, i. 69, 75, 90
Voiture, ii. 207
Volcae, i. 49
Voltaire, ii. 207, 230, 275, 293

Wagram, Battle of, ii. 424
Waldeck-Rousseau, ii. 536
Wallenstein, ii. 106
Walloon Flanders, i. 334
Walter de Maunay, i. 303
War, right of private, i. 195
Warnachaire of Burgundy, i. 122
Waterloo, ii. 455
Wends, i. 121
Wergild, i. 107
Westphalia, Treaty of, ii. 116, 251; Jerome Bonaparte, King of, 418
White Ship, wreck of the, i. 233
William the Conqueror, i. 187; Rufus, 188; de Nogaret, 285
Willibrod, St., i. 128
Winifred. *See* St. Boniface
Witigis, i. 90
Wolsey, Cardinal, i. 482
Wurmser, General, ii. 358

Yvetot, Battle of, ii. 59

Zachary, Pope, i. 132
Zola, Emile, ii. 535
Zürich, victory of, ii. 371; Treaty of, 502
Zwentibold of Lorraine, i. 174

THE TEMPLE PRESS LETCHWORTH ENGLAND